DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 132 UD 010 952

TITLE	Institute to Prepare Newly Graduated and Experienced Teachers for Work in Desegregated Schools. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Orleans Parish School Board, New Orleans, La.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	24 Jun 70
GRANT	OEG-0-8-000341-(036)
NOTE	155p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; Cultural Factors; Effective Teaching; *Human Relations; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Intergroup Relations; Principals; Race Relations; *School Integration; School Personnel; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Louisiana

ABSTRACT

There were 120 participants from three distinct groups: experienced teachers, newly graduated elementary and secondary teachers, and principals, who met from June 24, 1968 to June 30, 1970. Objectives of the program included the following: (1) teacher training; (2) interpersonal relations; (3) classroom skills and sensitivities for experienced teachers; (4) to observe successful instructional and motivational techniques; (5) to gain and apply human relations skills; and, (6) additional focus on principals' human relations skills and problems of administration and instruction incident to desegregation. (Authors/CB)

ED056132

FINAL REPORT

FOR

AN INSTITUTE TO PREPARE NEWLY GRADUATED AND EXPERIENCED TEACHERS FOR WORK IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

CONTRACTED TO

ORLEANS PARISH SCHOOL BOARD
703 CARONDELET STREET
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70130

UNDER

CONTRACT NUMBER: OEG - 0-8-000341-(036)
P.L. 88-352, TITLE IV, SECTION 404
THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

JUNE 26, 1970

UD 010 952

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FOREWORD

This final report has been prepared in the office of Special Projects of the Orleans Parish School Board.

Information in the abstract and in the Summer Institute Phase of the report was drawn from the extensive report prepared by the Directors of the Summer Institute.

It will be noted that the main body of this report repeats in most areas sections of the "Interim Report and Request for Program Modification" submitted on March 30 of this year. This prior report was an essential statement of the History, activities of the summer phase, and plans for the follow-up phase. It is therefore felt that much of the information contained therein constituted material for a final report with appropriate modifications and additions added.

2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword. i

Abstract. iii

Table I - Distribution of Program Participants (Summer Phase) v

Table II- (Follow-Up Phase) vi

NARRATIVE

I. History of Program 1

II. Summer Institute Phase 4

- A. Institute Organization. 4
- B. Evaluation Procedures 5
- C. Results and Conclusions . . . .

III. Follow-Up Phase--Request for Program Modification. 8

- A. Follow-Up Program 8
- B. Selection of Participants 8
- C. Schedule. 9
- D. Recommended Budget. 9
  Financial Recapitulation Sheet. 11
- E. Description and Results of Follow-Up Phase Activities. 12
- F. Conclusions and Recommendations 13

APPENDIX

I. Seminar Leaders' Summary Reports . . . . .A- I

II. Opinion Study, Analysis of Responses, Change Analysis for Beginning Teachers . . . . .A- II

III. Desegregation Checklist and Tabulation . . . . .A- III

IV. Participation Evaluation . . . . .A- IV

V. Recommended Guidelines for Intervisitation, Recommended Project Areas for Small Group Work, Development of Desegregation--Guidelines for Teachers. . . .A- V

VI. Memoranda and Agenda Pertinent to Follow-Up Phase. . . . . .A- VI

VII. Syllabi for Summer Phase . . . . .A- VII

VIII. Seminar Report from Follow-Up Phase on One Group's Activity . . . . .A-VIII

IX. Recommended Bibliography Distributed to Institute Members . . . . .A- IX

ABSTRACT

A. Identification

FINAL REPORT FOR AN INSTITUTE TO PREPARE NEWLY GRADUATED AND EXPERIENCED TEACHERS IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

Contract Number: OEG-0-000341-4521 (036)
P.L. 88-352, Title IV, Section 405
The Civil Rights Act of 1964

Program Officers: Mrs. Osceola W. Nelson, Director
Mr. Arthur R. Piattoly, Associate Director

Contractor: Orleans Parish School Board
703 Carondelet Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

The Project reported herein was supported by a contract from the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

B. Dates

Beginning Date: June 24, 1968

Ending Date: June 30, 1970

C. Participants

There were 120 participants from three distinct groups-experienced and newly graduated elementary and secondary teachers and principals in the New Orleans Public School system. The distributions are shown in Tables I and II.

D. Objectives of the Program

1. To provide a program of teacher training designed to prepare instructors for successful performance in desegregated schools.

2. To encourage understanding between the races by providing avenues of communication during the formative period of teacher education.

3. To provide experienced teachers with the additional skills and sensitivities needed to work with and overcome the classroom problems associated with desegregation.

4. To suggest practical teaching approaches through observance of instructional and motivational techniques successfully

implemented in desegregated schools.

5. To provide a laboratory in which participants gain and apply skills of human relations, communication and problem solving.

6. To engage principals in a series of training seminars with the major goals of improving human relations skills and focusing attention on those administrative and instructional problems incident to desegregation, both in the student body and faculty.

E. Results

Through intensive exposure to qualified speakers and consultants in the field of desegregation, active involvement in a multiplicity of learning experiences such as extensive outside reading assignments, group discussion and interaction, laboratory observation, and individual counseling, Objectives 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 listed above were affected to a considerable degree of success.

Because of the lack of representative teaching situations available for observation during the summer, Objective 4 was not adequately achieved. Both strengths and weaknesses in the Program will be discussed more thoroughly in Section II-C of this report. (See Sections III-E and III-F for results and outcome of the follow-up sessions.)

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS (SUMMER PHASE)

Category	Number Persons	Category	Number Persons
Level		Years Experience	
Elementary	42	0	22
Secondary	23	1-3	11
		4-6	7
Position		7-9	6
Teacher	61	10-15	5
Administrator	1	16-21	2
Other	3	21 or more	12
Race			
Negro	32	Age	
White	33	20-24	30
		25-29	6
Sex		30-34	5
Female	56	35-39	3
Male	9	40-44	4
		45-49	5
		50-54	6
		55-59	5
		60 or more	1

TABLE II

(FOLLOW-UP PHASE)

	Teachers	Principals
White	11	14
Black	21	38
Elementary	23	41
Secondary	9	11
Totals	32	52

Of the original 65 participants in the summer phase, 32 returned for the follow-up. The inability of the project to attract more of the original participants is accounted for by the postponement of the follow-up phase to a later date and the significant turnover of teachers in the system.

Table II reflects the emphasis of the program modification on recruitment of administrators for the follow-up phase.

1. HISTORY OF PROGRAM

The Institute proposal was developed by the Office of Special Projects and the Division of Instruction, Orleans Parish School Board, with ancillary support and cooperation supplied by the Center for Teacher Education, Tulane University, and the Division of Education, Dillard University. The Educational Resource Center on School Desegregation under the direction of Dr. Glenn Hontz, contributed support both in the formulation and later execution of the proposal.

The original proposal for this project was submitted on April 15, 1968, to be funded from May 1, 1968, through September 30, 1969. The program was accepted for funding with the stipulation that certain changes be made. These changes are recorded in an intra-system memo dated May 28, 1968 and include a budget revision and plan to include principals as participants in the program. As a result of the budget reivsion the number of participants was reduced from 100 to 80, and the training phase was reduced from six to four weeks. The operation of the Institute was scheduled to begin on June 24, 1968, and to end on July 19, 1968. A follow-up phase was to occur the first week of the Fall school term.

On May 29, 1968, a Special Bulletin was distributed to all school principals announcing approval of the Desegregation Institute and asking for nominations of persons to participate in the experienced teacher grouping of the program and to fill the administrative job positions.

On May 31, 1968, the Director of the Office of Special Projects regretfully informed the Office of Equal Educational Opportunity that the Orleans Parish school system would be unable to conduct the Institute, proposed to begin in less than a month, with these words:

"The unfortunate 'freeze on funds' has prevented us from making firm commitments to the persons we had hoped would furnish the Institute's leadership. It is also our feeling that sufficient time does not exist to properly plan a meaningful Institute that would achieve the sessions primary objectives. It would be less than proper to accept funds to operate a program that cannot be effective."

In a letter on June 19, 1968, the Director of Special Projects summarized the decisions reached in a conference with the Chief of the Southwest Branch Division of the Office of Equal Educational Opportunity which included the change on grant dates to begin Monday, June 24, 1968, and end August 31, 1969, thereby giving the Orleans Parish school system an opportunity to conduct the Institute during the summer of 1969. The letter also announced that the Superintendent of Schools would appoint the system's Supervisor of Professional Growth to the position of Planning Director for the Institute immediately upon receiving word from the Office of Equal Educational Opportunity that the changes were official.

On March 7, 1969, the Superintendent announced position vacancies for leadership of the Desegregation Institute. The first day of interviews for the position of Director was set for April 3, the number of applicants having been previously narrowed from 30 to five by a committee composed of the Planning Director for the Institute, the Personnel Assistant for Federal Projects, and two representatives from the Educational Resource Center on School Desegregation. Unfortunately, a teachers' strike began on April 3, the interview schedule was completely disrupted and the Supervisor of Professional Growth, who was serving as Planning Director for the Institute, resigned from the school system. As a result of these occurrences the selection of the Director and Associate Director was not completed until May 12.

The resignation of the Planning Director from the school system forced the responsibility for the selection of the seminar leaders and participants in the program on the Project Director and the Personnel Department of the school system at a late time.

The six positions for Seminar Leaders were filled following interviews with the 30 to 40 applicants who responded to the announcement of the vacancies. The interviewing committee was composed of the Project Director, the Personnel Assistant for Federal Projects, and the Director of the Educational Improvement Project. The following considerations went into the selection:

1) Group leadership experience.

2) Experience in desegregated teaching situations.

3) Maintenance of racial balance in the Project Staff.

4) Representation from the two participating universities.

Complications arising from misunderstandings among the participating universities and the school system as to the role the universities were to play in the program leadership delayed final selection of the Seminar Leaders. Their final approval by the Assistant Superintendent for the Division of Instruction, the Superintendent and the School Board and their placement on the payroll was not completed until a few days before the Institute began.

The participants were selected from two primary sources: a list of newly appointed teachers who had agreed to teach in desegregated situations and a group of experienced teachers who had responded to the Superintendent's announcement about the training program. Maintainence of racial balance was one criteria for selection. The fact that the Project Director was in a principalship within the school system and therefore had only limited time to devote to interviewing the participants further delayed the selection. The final grouping was not completed until a few days before the Institute started.

The Director of the Project chose the consultants for the program on the basis of the following criteria:

1) Prominency in the field of desegregation or in fields supportive to the goals of the projects, e.g. group dynamics, history of desegregation in Louisiana and New Orleans, human value and behavior.

2) Experience in desegregated teaching situations and/or with desegregated training.

3) Recommendation from the Education Resource Center for School Desegregation.

4) Approval by the Division on Instruction for the Orleans Parish School System.

5) Availability at the time of the institute.

Because of conflicting vacation schedules during the summer months, a new staff advisor to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of the Supervisor of Professional Growth was not available until the leaders and participants had been selected.

The Institute was conducted for the four weeks between June 16 and July 11, 1969. At the conclusion of the summer phase, the Director was returned to her principalship and the Associate Director was offered an assignment as an assistant principal for the regular school term beginning in August. The person who was Associate Director subsequently was returned to the program fulltime to proceed with the follow-up phase. He developed the program described in Section III, Follow-Up Phase-Request for Program Modification.

II. SUMMER INSTITUTE PHASE

A. INSTITUTE ORGANIZATION

1. Grouping

Since teachers emerging from colleges and universities have needs different from those of experienced teachers, the Institute was divided into two parts: an experienced teacher section under the guidance of the Institute Director, and a new-teacher section under the guidance of the Institute Associate Director.

Teachers who participated in the "new-teacher" section were selected on the basis of their future assignment to desegregated schools of the New Orleans public school system. When it became impossible to fill the quota for this section with newly graduated teachers, the remaining vacancies were filled by teachers who had never taught in a racially desegregated situation. Those assigned to elementary schools were given preference over those in secondary schools.

The two sections met separately: one group on the Tulane University campus and the other at Dillard University. Seminars and field experiences were completely separated with different staffs directing the activities of each group. Thirty-four new teachers and thirty-four experienced teachers were enrolled, with each group of thirty-four further divided into three seminar groups.

2. Agenda

The Institute met daily from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. between June 16 and July 11, 1969. In the mornings major addresses were made by visiting consultants on topics germane to desegregation or observation inthe laboratory schools.

In the afternoons, small group meetings were a vehicle for many supporting activities such as book reporting, seminar analysis of issues and exchange of viewpoint, film viewing and individual meetings with the consultants.

An integral part of the Institute was visits to educationsl and recreational programs for children and to other community facilities--all of which contributed to an understanding of the total setting for educational development in New Orleans.

3. Graduate Credit

Six hours of graduate credit was offered by Tulane University to teachers in the program who on their own officially registered as Special Students in the Graduate School of Education. Thirteen persons received such credit.

B. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Evaluation was effected by means of (1) three questionnaires which were completed by Institute participants and (2) individual reports by Seminar Leaders.[1] Information on these questionnaires was obtained by assessing self-development and attitude change gained from participation in the Institute. These changes resulted from talks by the visiting consultant on topics germane to desegregation and its underlying intimations, small group discussions and cooperation in exchange of issues and viewpoint, personal consultations with the visiting consultants, book reporting on subjects relevant to desegregation and visitation in schools in which an ESEA Title I Summer Program, Activities for Individual Development (AID), was being conducted. A compilation of information in these questionnaires consititued an overall evaluation of subject areas of the Desegregation Institute.

Results of the various evaluations are summarized below.

1. Opinion Study

An opinionnaire, consisting of 115 items, was administered to both sections of the Institute. The new-teacher group was given the test at the beginning and at the end of the Institute, while only the pretest was administered to the experienced group at the end of the Institute.[2] Of the 115 items contained in the opinion study, 23 dealt with racial feelings, 9 with attitudes in the area of economics, 21 with education, 16 with human relations, 4 with intelligence, 25 with social class, 2 directly related to emotions, 13 behaviorally oriented, and 4 not given to ready classification were listed as miscellaneous.

In the experienced teacher group, items related to economics and government yielded more negative responses than items relating to human relationships and race, which yielded more positive responses. These positive responses reflect a meeting of Institute objectives. Administration of the opinion study to the new-teacher phase reflected similarly encouraging results with many of the items dealing with racial prejudice and discrimination indicating marked improvement on the post-test.

2. Desegregation Checklist

The Desegregation Checklist, designed for teachers already working in desegregated situations and consequently administered only to the experienced teacher group, deals with self-analysis and teacher technique study. Of 900 possible responses, 674 indicated that the

---

[1] See Appendix 1 for these documents.

[2] Administration of a post-test was precluded due to the program modification of the follow-up phase.

12

teachers had begun, and in some instances were succeeding in, a unitary teaching approach. One hundred eleven responses indicated that no consideration was being given, while 126 did not respond. The self-evaluation phase of the checklist indicates marked evidence of positive change.

3. Participant Evaluation

All participants of the Institute completed an Institute Evaluation Form designed to evaluate the administration of the program. In assessing the overall value of the Institute, 79.8 per cent of participants rated the Desegregation Institute as Excellent or Good.

4. Seminar Leaders Reports

The consensus was that Institute objectives were significantly met. Appendix 1 contains the text of reports. These give insight into the ongoing activities of the summer phase.

C. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Strengths

Through intensive exposure to qualified speakers and consultants in the field of desegregation, active involvement in a multiplicity of learning experiences such as group discussion and interaction, book reporting, laboratory observation, and individual counseling, the teacher training program of the Desegregation Institute was effected to a considerable degree of success. There were some weaknesses in the program, which will be noted later, but as a whole it was a successful example of how teachers, both newly graduated and experienced, can be prepared to deal with the problems occasioned by desegregation.

Suggested readings and small-group discussions were considered to be the most beneficial facets of the Institute with speakers and panelists injecting variety and interest to the overall program. Contact and confrontation of ideas and opinions with individuals of different social and economic groups created interpersonal relationships and tested attitudes on desegregation that resulted in development of rapport among members of the Institute. Significantly, the bulk of written evaluations by participants provided verification of this factor.

The program, by making teachers aware of the problems confronting them in a desegregated school setting and the many demands which will be placed upon them in this situation, demonstrated the possibility of developing an intelligent, methodical approach for meeting the instructional and interpersonal needs of desegregated settings.

Because of the several advantages to be gained in personal impact, evaluation of summer phase activities, and overall program effectiveness, the decision was made to delay the follow-up phase until after participants had worked in their actual school situations for several months.

2. Weaknesses

Although 79.8 per cent of the participants rated the Institute as generally good or excellent, they did point out some deficiencies. The three weaknesses most often cited in reports of the seminar leaders and the participants were the following:

1) Irrelevancy of some of the speakers' topics

2) Inadequate dissemination of organizational and administrative information prior to the Institute

3) Insufficient opportunity for observation of teaching situations representative of the regular school year program and students.

The summer program, which provided the teaching situations, was aimed at ESEA Title I target neighborhoods and drew very few white children. The alleged irrelevancy of some presentations and the inadequate advance dissemination of information are attributable in part to the problems encountered during the months immediately preceding the Institute (discussed in Section I).

The lesson of lack of adequate realistic planning reinforced the decision to design a follow-up phase only after staff and participants had ample opportunity to reflect on the results of the summer activities.

III. FOLLOW-UP PHASE -- REQUEST FOR PROGRAM MODIFICATION

As originally proposed, the follow-up phase would have taken place shortly after the summer Institute. For several reasons cited in previous sections, leaders of the Institute decided to defer the follow-up until participants had had an opportunity to work in their school situations for several months.

The purpose of the request for program modification was to reschedule the follow-up phase and reallocate available funds for maximum effectiveness.

A. FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM

Experience gained from last summer's Desegregation Institute pointed to the desirability of maximizing the role of the small group approach to problems of desegregation. Participants generally felt that this was a better way to approach the problems of desegregation--- face to face with opportunity to vent personal feelings and fears and problems. It was therefore proposed that the follow-up sessions to last summer's proposal utilize this method to the fullest extent without, however, sacrificing any distinct advantages that could accrue to pertinent and meaningful alternate methods, i.e., the use of resource or visiting consultants.

Participants were mailed questionnaires to determine:

1) Which persons associated with last summer's Institute were willing to participate in a follow-up series.
2) Feelings of interested participants toward the content of follow-up sessions.

Seminar leaders planned, along with the follow-up coordinator and appropriate school system and resource personnel, a series of three five-hour training sessions. These sessions were based largely upon the expressed needs of the participants as reflected in the questionnaire survey and proceeded upon a small group discussion basis. Two speakers were selected to speak upon problems incident to desegregation. One of these was a School Board member and the other was the school system's Director of Curriculum Services, who has for years coordinated professional growth activities for the system. This talk centered upon the role of interpersonal relationships in the desegregation process. Activities were scheduled on Saturday mornings at a cooperating university.

B. SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Participants were selected on a priority basis as follows:

1) Persons who were included in the summer phase

15

2) Other teachers and principals who were involved in desegregation-related activity

Widening of the objectives of the original proposal to specifically make an effort to include principals was done for the following reasons as stated in the Interim Report.

"Since last summer the Orleans Parish School system has entered a new and crucial phase in its development-faculty desegregation. The obvious leaders in the successful completion of this process will be the principals, who are responsible for efficient operation of the schools at the operating level. It is they, along with teachers, who should be best prepared to expedite desegregation problems. Another objective of the follow-up sessions will be to have teachers and administrators develop desegregation guidelines for use in coming months. It is further hoped that many of these teachers can be used as resource persons who will meet with teachers to be transferred under the new board policy. A goal would be the development of articulate, well informed teams who would be able to effect positive attitude change among as many teachers as possible. As a result of this program modification we hope, therefore, to see the creation of a core of teachers and administrators who will serve as a base not only for faculty sensitization to desegregation problems but to the larger problem of staff development in general."

C. SCHEDULE

Follow-up planning was begun on a systematic basis beginning in mid-February and was completed during March after the appointment of the Planning and Evaluation Coordinator. This person planned a series of three follow-up sessions scheduled on Saturday, during the months of April and early May. Seminar leaders met on two occasions for planning purposes.

D. RECOMMENDED BUDGET

Project E-341 Grant No: OEG-0-8-000341-4521-(036)

Proposed Program Expenditures for Follow-Up Segment of Project
Spring and Summer 1970

Direct Costs:
A. Compensation for Personal Services

1 - Coordinator for Planning & Evaluation 4 months @ $1,147/month	$4,588.00
1 - Secretary 3½ months @ $350/month	1,225.00
8 - Seminar Leaders 250 hours(total) @ $10/hr.	2,500.00
3 - Visiting Teachers 60 hours(total) @ $5/hr.	300.00
5 - Consultants 10 days(total) @ $75/day	750.00
	$9,363.00

B.	Compensation for Substitute Personnel	
	None	
C.	Employee Services and Benefits	
	Retirement @ 9.96% for above salaries other than consultants	858.00
	Injury on duty @ .1% for above salaries other than consultants	9.00
		867.00
D.	Compensation for Participants	
	95 - participants 15 hours(each) @ $3/hour	4,275.00
E.	Supplies, materials and equipment	
	Office supplies	100.00
	Instructional supplies and materials	1,324.00
		$1,424.00
F.	Fee Payments	
	None	
G.	Travel	
	Local travel - coordinator and seminar leaders, 1400 miles(total) @ 10¢/mile	140.00
	Consultants travel-transportation 2 @ $200 each	400.00
	Consultants travel-per diem 4 days @ $16/day	64.00
	Coordinators travel-transportation 1 @ $150; 2 @ $80	310.00
	Coordinators travel-per diem 4 days @ $16/day	64.00
		$978.00
H.	Communications	
	Postage	60.00
	Telephone	25.00
		85.00
I.	Printing	200.00
J.	Transportation costs	
	None	
K.	Services	
	None	
L.	Other	
	Compensation to universities for costs incurred while using their facilities	150.00
	TOTAL	$17,342.00

GRANT NO. - OEG-0-8-000341-4521-(038)

	DIRECT COSTS	ACTUAL & PLANNED EXPENSE			PROPOSED BUDGET REVISION		
		Actual Expend/Commit, Summer-Fall 1969	Planned Expend. Spring-Summer 1970	Total Required Full Program	Present Budget (Rev #1)	Proposed Budget - Changes Required	Proposed Budget - Final
A.	Comp. for Personal Services	$ 22520 -	$ 9363 -	$ 31883 -	$ 28150 -	(+) 3733 -	$ 31883 -
B.	Comp. for Subs. Personnel	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
C.	Employee Services and Benefits	1119 -	867 -	1986 -	1813 -	(+) 173 -	1986 -
D.	Comp. for Participants	18788 -	4275 -	23063 -	27600 -	(-) 4537 -	23063 -
E.	Supplies, Mat'l & Equip.	235 -	1424 -	1659 -	800 -	(+) 859 -	1659 -
F.	Fee Payments	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
G	Travel	514 -	978 -	1492 -	1980 -	(-) 488 -	1492 -
H	Communications	34 -	85 -	119 -	125 -	(-) 6 -	119 -
I	Printing	70 -	200 -	270 -	150 -	(+) 120 -	270 -
J.	Transportation Costs	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
K.	Services	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
L.	Other	1540 -	150 -	1690 -	1544 -	(+) 146 -	1690 -
	TOTAL BUDGET	$ 44820 -	$ 17342 -	$ 62162 -	$ 62162 -	-0-	$ 62162 -

E. DESCRIPTION AND RESULTS OF FOLLOW-UP PHASE ACTIVITIES

1. Participants

Follow-up sessions were attended by a total of 84 participants of which thirty-two were teachers. The emphasis upon recruitment of principals reflects the concern of the school system to lay the foundation for a longer range program of professional growth for principals, especially in the area of human relations problems incident to desegregation.

2. Organization & Schedule

Participants were organized for follow-up activities in two groups, principals and teachers. The teacher group met on April 4, 11, and May 2. The principals met on April 18, 25, and May 2. On May 2, sessions were organized around principal-teacher exchange of views. Both principals and teachers were assigned in groups to seminar leaders for the purpose of follow-up activities. A project social-worker was assigned, in line with original project objectives, to consult with all groups. All groups met on the campus of Dillard University in attractive well-accommodated quarters.

3. Activities & Procedures

Of basic importance to follow-up activities was the development of desegregation guidelines by both principals and teachers. This approach to seminar activities was two-fold: First, it served the human relations purpose of providing a basis for meaningful and productive discussion for the racially integrated groups. These guidelines dealt with problems incident to the following elements in the desegregation process---the teacher, the principal, the community, the student and the organization of resources for Instructional Improvement. Secondly, it served to focus the thinking of participants on areas of intensified emotional impact incident to the desegregation process.

Principals also devoted some time to the preparation of a plan for the intervisitation of administratively transferred teachers incident to the institution of a faculty desegregation plan for the 1970-71 school session. In virtue of this activity and the attention of the participant to development of desegregation guidelines, the Institute follow-up served as a bridge between last summer's activities and the development of a viable training program for next school session. The orientation of principals and teachers to problem areas incident to desegregation during this follow-up series has created a nucleus of motivated professionals, particularly among the middle-management strata of the school system who are most able to effect change-oriented programs. It is felt that, in view of the fact that over 1/3 of the entire principal corps attended the sessions and that the response of these persons was so universally favorable, a strong beginning has been made toward expediting successful faculty desegregation:

Much, of course, remains to be done in training both principals and teachers for urban education. On May 2, principals and teacher groups were merged for the purpose of interchange on problems of mutual interest. This proved to be of value to each group, as each felt able to express their concerns in an atmosphere of free discussion.

4. Participant Reaction to Follow-Up

In the majority, both principals and teachers expressed the opinion that the follow-up sessions served to enhance their skills in human relations. Among other values accruing to them were the benefits of open discussion on desegregation problems: one teacher stated "she was able to gain a clearer view of her own feelings and opinions because of the opportunity to present them to others in small group discussion." Nearly all teachers and principals expressed their approval of the follow-up sessions as 1) serving to achieve the goals of human relations development between black and white and 2) focusing attention upon the fundamental problem areas of desegregation.

5. Reports of Seminar Leaders:

Full reports of seminar leaders for both the summer and follow-up phases are included in Appendix One.

F. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The Institute on Desegregation and the subsequent follow-up sessions proved to be a successful initial step in the mitigation of the professional growth and instructional problems incident to desegregation of the public schools. Experience in the project has pointed to what are the most promising approaches to certain kinds of professional growth activities for teachers and principals; it has given a corps of these professionals the opportunity to express their needs and to help structure training formats most consonant to them; it has focused attention upon some long-standing school-system problems as well as many problem areas incident to desegregation most seriously of all, it has clearly defined the necessity for ongoing programs designed to help more and more of those persons who work with children. These programs should be designed to broaden the human relations and instructional capacities of principals to work with both black and white teachers and students; of teachers to work with each other; and to enhance the abilities of all teachers to work more effectively with all students both as an instructor and as a person capable of relating to the problems of students.

APPENDIX I

SEMINAR LEADERS' SUMMARY REPORTS

21

INSTITUTE FOR THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

Summary Report   Group I   Mrs. Gunde M. Williams

Group I consisted of eleven secondary level teachers, nine of which were in teaching positions, one an administrator and one a librarian. All had some years of professional experience. Six members had less than ten years experience, and five members had more than ten years of experience. Four participants were Negro, and seven were white. All participants worked in desegregated schools.

When I began working with the group, I was startled by many of the participants' apparent lack of motivation and a prevailing attitude of investing little effort toward meeting the objectives of the institute. With expectations made clear, this quickly changed and each group member began to work, that is to read, to think and to share. Initially, it appeared to me, the group looked for very direct leadership in that they expected concrete answers to the questions raised. Some early confusion, restlessness and perhaps resentment resulted from my attempts to engage the group members in defining the problems we could deal with; to sort out those that were beyond the scope of the institute; my emphasizing the need for all to search for solutions; to find our own answers, and to tolerate some ambiguity. Many raised problems so very complex that they did not lend themselves to easy solutions. Great value was placed on speakers who "gave answers" and were "thought producing", less on those whose presentation stirred up pretty powerful and troublesome feelings. However, with increasing ease and comfort between the group members,with sharing of experiences first and feelings subsequently, all came to feel that the small group discussions were of great importance and value to them. Group members developed enough of a feeling of safety within the group to confront each other, to examine long held attitudes in the light of new knowledge and begin to change some - yet hold on to others. Naturally, not everyone was equally open to attitudinal changes, but many existing misunderstandings were clarified.

Much of our small group discussion reflected the input of the presentation of Drs. Dixon, Bondi, Lloyd, Gruwell and Rucker and the school observations, films and reading. The following is an attempt to highlight the main themes of our discussions and to list some generally accepted findings and/or suggested solutions.

We started with the premise that presently our educational system is not effective for all people. Since our nation has compulsory education, it is essential that the system be improved to meet the educational needs of all pupils more effectively. By education we do not only mean intellectual learning but the goal of the school should be to prepare a pupil to live with himself and others in a responsible and productive way, to earn a living and to learn about political and cultural matters. Thus, the educational system should not exist closed off from the environment but should be open and responsive to the surrounding community. We need to overcome resistance to giving parents, key people in the community and even students a voice in "their" school. Only by being in contact with the larger community can we prepare pupils for their future roles in society: citizen, worker, parent. We need to reestablish contact with parents, and listen to their concerns. How can we overcome parents' apparent disinterest?

By reaching out in a meaningful way - personal contact, telephone call or note, telling the parent something about his child's progress....

By having the schools open to parents, to let them know their interest is welcome even if the time of their visit is inconvenient to the teacher...

Through community contacts the school administration could find talented and suitable persons whose skills could be utilized adjunctively, for example,an automechanic teaching a special workshop.

The school administration also needs to be aware of and able to utilize community resources especially for pupils' physical and mental health problems in addition to close cooperation with the Visiting Teachers system.

Frustration was voiced about the complicated and tedious procedure to get a child tested and when it finally is accomplished the IQ or psychometric results do not give much help when the child is in need of psychological counseling as there are too few treatment facilities. Keeping children who are emotionally severely damaged in the regular classroom often is of no benefit to them and is disturbing to the rest of the class. Being "excused" from school attendance also is no solution for the troubled child even though it relieves the teacher. This kind of problem is not the sole responsibility of the school system but requires social action.

Concern was raised about the likelihood of vandalism if the schools are kept open. This is a reality problem but seems to reflect the feeling the school belongs to no one, as the people around lack a feeling of participation and thus have little interest in protecting the school property. Our worries are a reflection of a generally faulty value system, namely material goods (school property) rate higher than the people's need to use the school.

We say in this country we value education very highly yet an extremely small proportion of public funds have been allocated for this purpose. We have the educational technology (teaching machines, programmed education) to help children learn yet insufficient money to provide these whenever and wherever necessary. There is need for citizen action to close the gap between avowed values and norms.

A child learn with his total self and has to master conflicting demands - the need for self expression and the need to conform with school expectations. Throughout life he will have to achieve a creative synthesis between impelling wishes and compelling demands, between self expression and conformity. How can we foster a child's innate creativity.? The teacher needs to introduce a sense of excitement and emphasize the role of discovery in learning. A child needs freedom to try something, needs determination to solve problem on own, needs a sense of self-confidence in his abilities and needs to feel unthreatened and confortable in his relationship with his teacher.

In an attempt to make teaching more relevant to all children, attention has been focused on ways of reaching and meeting the needs of disadvantaged children and black children. Teachers' unfamiliarity with both of these groups' life-experiences had resulted in misunderstandings and many false assumptions.

Some of these were clarified through at times painful sharing of incidents of prejudice among group members. We discussed some of the psychological and social causes of prejudice in general: assumption that visible difference carries equivalent difference in kind, fear of the strange, the unfamiliar, fear makes us uncomfortable so we hate what makes us anxious. Insecure and threatened people need scapegoats to vent their aggression, to elevate their low self esteem, to gain a feeling of dominance and power, to project guilt. We also discussed some of the color symbolism: white equals clean and good, black equals dirty and bad. We brought out the devastating effects of labeling and stereotyping and our tendency to claim that professional Negroes are exceptions. In doing so, we take people who do not fit the stereotype out of the group rather than correcting the stereotype which is so essential to do.

We talked about the need all of us have to belong to a group, an in-group which we strengthen by having an out-group to which we contrast and thus strengthen our in-group feeling. Really one of the most effective aspects of our group-meetings was the opportunity of white and black to become acquainted with each other and to have an opportunity to correct faulty notions.

Some examples: whites felt that in the South Negro servants were considered "part of the family" and "treated well" - yet the whites would discuss family matters in front of them as if they were not present, which reflected that fact that Negroes were not treated as mature autonomous human beings. This examplified the fact that white altruism is based on a feeling of superiority and thus devastating. Another example of confronted white arrogance was a statement that Negro teachers in New Orleans should be satisfied with the equality they have achieved - "what else do they want"? This question called for clarification of the lack of true acceptance by collegues and the work that needs to be done to help reluctant parents and children to realize that a black person can be truly professional.

The following are some points we identified for teachers working with black pupils: They need to be fully familiar with the concept of "self fulfilling prophecy". They need to dispel the myth that lower class Negroes do not value education or do not care to work, instead they need to understand how apathy resulted because employment was denied as were positions in line with their educational achievement. They need a full understanding of the social conditions that brought about present day results - apathy, rage etc. Our discussions enabled us to see how much people are products of their various life experiences and thus understand the logic of their behavior even though we may not always like the behavior. This again makes clear our responsibility as citizens to bring about social changes.

White teachers often felt reluctant to demand of black children the same behavior as of white children thinking that "singing or dancing in the halls" was a characteristic of their race. Also fear that black children would accuse a white teacher of discriminatory actions when punished. Standards of behavior should be set and enforced equally for black and white children.

Teachers need to furnish books, magazines and pictures portraying black and white persons in all walks of life so that children of all backgrounds can find representation and sources for identification.

A good deal of our discussions centered on teaching the "disadvantaged" child - by that we mean children who are in some ways blocked from achieving their full potential by their adverse social situation. Teachers need to learn about the child's background - if needed through contact with his family - we referred here to the handout "Do lower class children have needs I don't know about"? Another example may be a child falling asleep in class - Is this a result of actual lack of sleep at night or do we have an extremely anxious child who retreats into sleep, into something safe whenever he feels too threatened in the class situation?

Up to recently we have seen low achievement, drop-out poor motivation etc. as result of deprivation, of deficiencies in his environment while now we have come to realize that these deficiencies are more a result of a system not oriented to the needs of each child and that changes can be made in the educational process to adapt it more to the needs of various kinds of students. We discussed programs such as Headstart which is planned to compensate for a child's lack of stimulation in his home' environment and to ready him for entrance into the school system, yet these benefits will not last unless his educational experience in the following grades in conducive to learning. The main importance is for teachers to expect children to learn. Tests have proven that as a teacher looks at a group of pupils so they will turn out. Even if for some children academic achievement is minimal, they can be given tasks in line with their ability to achieve. If a teacher's standards are too high, a child will get the feeling that he can never measure up and will give up - feeling there is no use. Teaching has to be related to these children's life experiences, they should be engaged in exploying and thinking with particular encouragement given to their verbal participation so that they can use and build upon their language skills.

We had a lot of conflicting opinion about the present day notion that the issue is not so much to make the learner come up to existing school expectations but to re-examine teaching methods and to make them more congruent with the learners' needs. While some disagreed that the school should lower standards for a group of learners, others felt there should be a more practical branch for those who cannot meet the regular demands of highschool. All agreed that more emphasis must be placed on helping students to find legitimate sources of identity and self esteem in order to promote their social growth.

We discussed the pros and cons of ability grouping, especially the danger of typing a child and implicitly expecting him to stay in that group. We also aired the pros and cons of homework, the teacher's need to give homework versus the child's need or the parent's expectation. The important issue here is to consider the factors which will effect a child's ability to achieve. Dr. Gruwell"s presentation about motivation was very helpful especially the point that if a task is consistently beyond the child's to master, he gets turned off from the educational system as his frustration and anxiety preclude further learning. This pattern often is reflected in being tardy or absent because they are failing which only means they miss more and finally drop out as they can't possibly catch up. The same negative results are achieved by "suspending" children for three days as a form of punishment!

How can teachers' let their pupils know that they care? This can be communicated through calling the child by name, by establishing eye contact; by listening to a child as well as answering some of his questions of more personal nature. This kind of sharing will reach the child and he will see the teacher as a caring person with whom he can identify. One groupmember related how she used a couple of Spanish words in speaking to a boy from Cuba which delighted him and made him feel accepted.

Dr. Rucker's presentation on essential values based on fundamental human needs - the presence of which will move a person toward achieving his full potential, the lack of which will create pathology - resulted in fruitful discussion and had much practical implication for the class room.

To summarize, the groupmembers achieved the following objectives of the institute:

1. Development of increased understanding of and sensitivity to members' own and other races.

2. Recognition of the necessity to gain fullest possible understanding of each childs life experience in order to reach him and to meet his education needs (including promotion of social growth) and to stimulate him to advance as much as he has the potential to do.
3. Identification of complex and interrelated causes for school-failure with resultant recognition of the need to individulaize teaching as much as possible - as each child wants to learn, to belong and to succeed.
4. Increased groupmembers' insight into some of their personal bias and awareness of the need to control it so that it does not interfere with their ability to establish positive relationships with their pupils.
5. Increased ability to relate to and to communicate with variety of children by making comments, showing interest, asking open-end questions (as opposed to asking for one word or yes-no response) about something we think the child has something to say.
6. Recognition of how deeply ingrained the existing pattern of education is,. opening of eyes and ears

to the fact that the educational system can be different - resulting in thinking about what can and must be done and daring to experiment with some innovations.

To implement this, suggestion was made to:

a. to have closer cooperation between teachers, principals and the school board, so that the "system" can become more open and flexible and cooperative in developing an educational process capable of dealing with diversity of student needs.

b. to clarify the role of consultant - who is considered as a threat rather than helpful. Especially young teachers have felt reluctant to ask questions for fear of being considered ignorant. This has stifled innovation as fear of failure had dampened a spirit of experimentation.

c. to correct the notion that equates good discipline with good teaching. Some teachers maintain discipline based upon fear which blocks learning, thus they are not truly educating their pupils.

d. to place teachers in poverty area schools only if they have special aptitude or training for working with the poor, and to give teachers who have been successful in teaching children of very deprived backgrounds some special recognition rather than transferring them to a "better" school.

35

INSTITUTE FOR THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT -- ELAINE ARMOUR WOLO
SEMINAR LEADER, GROUP II

OBJECTIVES ATTAINED

Objective 1: To familiarize the teacher with life circumstances of pupils in order to establish rapport necessary for effective training.

This objective was obtained via readings and book reports on Negro life and history and on the various minorities in the United States. The feeling was that much was already known about the majority group in the U.S. -- that we needed to fill in the gaps where minorities were concerned.

Three participants reported on current biographical novels which give a description of life in the ghetto (Malcolm X, Eldridge Cleaver, Claude Brown). Discussions of local ghetto groups such as Thugs United, Total Community Action Programs, and of settlement ideas as shown in Kingsley House, added to the realization of life circumstances.

As most of the participants are involved with either Negro children or white children, discussions of disadvantaged children in each of these groups were pertinent. Contributions of Negro teachers made richly rewarding additions to the seminar discussions. Many Negro teachers worked with totally black groups of children and had much to bring to the group. None of the Negro teachers in Group II worked with an integrated class last year. Both Negro and white teachers worked with Negro children, however. As both groups of teachers had worked with the Negro child, both had excellent personal references with good examples of life circumstances of children in the communities in which they work.

Objective 2: To make education meaningful through the presentation of subject matter, so that it is relevant to their life experiences.

To fulfill this objective, there was a presentation by the seminar leader of teaching aids and materials which emphasized the contributions of Negroes to American life. Also included in this presentation were materials on the American Indian, Chinese Americans, Japanese Americans and Mexican Americans. The presentatic included a pictorial display (flat pictures and artifacts), along with filmstrips and recordings, and the use of transparencies and overhead projection. Following the presentation, teachers discussed techniques they had used to work with the Negro child. Much of the material presented could be used to enhance the self-concept of the Negro child.

Objective 3: To prepare teachers in newly desegregated schools to cope with unfamiliar situations.

Group II achieved this objective to a degree. Teachers felt it impossible to discuss unfamiliar situations without actual in=school experiences in which they could work and try to solve some of the problemsin the desegregated schools. Teachers who had worked in the desegregated setting brought out some things which seemed unfamiliar to them.

Observations in the AID schools did not provide enough of a real experience for these experienced teachers. Teachers felt that this observation was inadequate for this objective.

Objective 4: To help teachers accept people as having individual merit.

Objective 4 was well done. Discussions and presentations on all minority groups made for greater understanding and made this objective come alive. The filmstrips, "Minorities Have Made America Great", were appropriate for all groups save the Negro minority. In other groups, the films gave very positive orientations to the life of the minority presented -- with the Negro group, some distasteful aspects of Negro life were included in the filmstrip. The feeling of participants was that it would do more to damage the Negro child than to make him proud of his heritage.

At the conclusion of the institute, participants felt that they had a greater awareness of others and that they would be more ready to accept individuals as having individual merit.

Objective 5: To promote understanding between the races by providing avenues of communication.

This objective was definitely achieved. There was excellent rapport in the group. The seminar leader and group members were on a first name basis very early in the session. By the final week, participants were invited by the seminar leader to a luncheon featuring local food -- red beans and rice. The participants met at the home of the seminar leader and shared the experience with the leader's family. The luncheon was a beautiful relaxed time. For some black and white participants, this was the first time they had shared an interracial social event. A guest at the luncheon was the Institute social worker.

As additional support of the good rapport in Group II, the group members surprised the seminar leader with a gift. The gift was presented at the conclusion of the luncheon.

There was excellent communication between group members. There was hardly a time when the group was not able to deal honestly and directly with questions or problems as they arose -- even discussions of race, which sometimes got quite emotional, members of the group dealt honestly with each other. Group members rated the seminar leader as "excellent" on the final evaluation sheet.

Objective 6: To provide teachers with additional skills and sensitivities needed to work with and overcome problems associated with desegregation.

Objective was achieved to a degree. Much more is necessary before teachers are really prepared to deal with the sensitivities they need in the desegregated setting. One speaker, Dr. Dixon, provided a vantage point for sensitivity discussions which made teachers quite aware of the problems inherent in the desegregated setting. Dr. Lloyd provided teachers with thought provoking situations in the community and challenged teachers to be more active in their communities. Many of the ideas expressed by Dr. Dixon were also expressed by Dr. Lloyd.

This objective might be included in the follow-up activities

Objective 7: To suggest practical teaching approaches through observance of instructional and motivational techniques successfully implemented in desegregated schools.

This was achieved, but not enough. More on this objective might be a consideration for the follow-up activities. See objective 2 for teaching approach.

Objective 8: To provide a laboratory in which particiants gain and apply skills of human relations, communication, and problem solving.

Objective 8 was achieved but to a limited extent. Laboratory experiences were inadequate for this objective. See objective 5.

ACTIVITIES ENGAGED BY THE LEADER WITH GROUP II

In the main, mornings were spent observing teachers in the AID schools. In the afternoons, teachers met for small group discussions (see schedule in Final Report Group II) except where other activities were scheduled for all participants.

Group visits were to Kingsley House, Audubon School, and Bradley School. Kingsley House was thoroughly integrated; Audubon School was predominately Negro -- only four white children; Bradley School was desegregated. In Audubon School, the faculty was integrated -- also in Bradley School. Teachers were welcomed in each situation.

In small group seminars, discussions ran the gamut. Teachers discussed black history, racism and prejudice, life in disadvantaged areas, stereotypes of blacks/whites, improvement of teaching, of educational techniques; motivation, values, teacher morale, the self concept, etc. etc. In one session, a participant reported on the book, Blues People, and brought and played records for each period outlined in the book. The book presented the history of the Negro through his music. Another participant reported on the history of the Negro in America -- this participant, a white female, brought to bear the many facts which had been left out of American history. All discussions were stimulating .

Role playing was a part of the small group seminar. Participants dramatized themselves, the principal, parents, and pupils in the desegregated setting.

MAJOR IDEAS AND CONCLUSIONS

1) The Institute on Desegregation was highly successful.

2) Seminar leaders worked well together and tried to deal honestly with members of their groups. One drawback to the seminar leaders was that they were not notified soon enough prior to the beginning of the Institute. It would have been good to spend some time together as a unit before starting to work in the Institute.

3) Experienced teachers need to participate in AID schools, instead of observing other teachers at work. Many of these teachers are extremely qualified and resourceful and could bring much to the summer programs. Teachers might participate at least three mornings a week and spend the other time in small group seminars.

4) Participants gained insight into some of their own biases and worked hard to deal with bias as they saw it. Some stated that they will try to deal with problems of desegregation in a different light as a result of experiences in this institute.

5) Participants in the Institute (Group II) felt an urge to include parents in the school activities. In past years many of the teachers have been reluctant to include parents for one reason or another. In the final evaluation, however, teachers expressed that they will definitely extend themselves in their communities and work toward parent involvement in the learning process.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

1) The follow-up activities should begin at the end of the first marking period.

2) Teachers should have time to discuss related problems experienced during the first month or trimester of school.

3) Speakers should be kept to a minimum, except where teachers themselves are prepared to present their experiences to the group -- lecture on experiences, panel of experienced teachers, etc.

4) There should be a time when teachers can relay back some of the ways the summer institute helped them deal with problems they encounter in the fall. When they are able to handle situations solely because of experiences in the Institute, this should be noted.

5) Teachers should receive a list of expectations or requirements for follow-up activities before they report for these activities. A bit of low morale experienced in the summer institute could have been avoided if teachers had a definite understanding of requirements, etc. prior to that Institute.

6) The follow-up activities should not exceed three sessions.

Elaine A. Wolo
(Mrs.) Elaine Armour Wolo
July 31, 1969

INSTITUTE FOR THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

Report on Group III -- Arthur Cooper, Seminar Leader

I. Makeup of the Group

The group consisted of eleven experienced teachers. There were four White and seven Black teachers. The two men in the group were white, one of whom was of Spanish-American descent. Several had more than 20 years of experience in the school system. Only one teacher had but one year of experience. All had elementary classroom teaching experience, but their assignments at present include: an art specialist, a remedial reading specialist, an art consultant and a home-bound teacher. Age roughly correlated with experience varying from the early twenties to the mid-fifties. All appeared to be career teachers with the possible exception of the art specialist.

II. Group Interaction

Interaction was determined by several factors; among them: previous participation with similar experiences; verbal ability; previous attitudes on race, teaching and human behavior; emotional liability; expectations of the Institute; and the training , orientation and experience of the group leader.

Only a few of the teachers had previously engaged in like institutes but one had had experience with a psychodynamically-oriented interracial group. She proved to be a constructive catalyst in the group interaction.

As might have been expected with teachers, all were capable of being quite verbal, but most were used to making statements or lecturing rather than engaging in free verbal interchange. A few of the teachers were unable to fully change this proclivity and tended to remain inhibited in expression. On the whole, however, these teachers became more secure as the group progressed. Even the more timid ones became more participants than observers.

Some of the teachers remained detatched; calm to the point of being phlegmatic. Several entered the sessions with strong feelings and even active animosity. Latent hostility became overt and was then available for confrontation and examination. Only a few of the teachers seemed frightened by this but were ultimately able to acknowledge their fear, test their feelings, and emerge more secure than they had been.

Previous attitudes toward the subject matter were identified as prejudices and examined as such. Attitudes of both blacks and whites toward one another and the children they taught were exposed.

Similarly, their attitudes toward their supervisors (including principals and consultants), school board administrators and members, the "community", and parents of advantaged and disadvantaged students were identified and looked at.

Some of the participants anticipated the group would be a "sensitivity" experience and reacted accordingly. Others looked for specific prescriptions for handling disruptive behavior. The majority were mainly hopeful that the Institute would somehow prepare them better for subsequent teaching but did not know how this would come about.

The group leader, a social worker trained and experienced in group process, is a layman with respect to education. He stimulated the group toward expression of diverse attitudes and feelings with the hope of providing a corrective experience. With the help of the participants he was able to identify with the classroom situation with which the teacher must cope.

Interaction was often intense but usually goal-oriented. On those occasions when the group strayed from its goals, they would generally bring themselves back to relevance by bringing and sharing their classroom and other life experiences.

The group leader took an active and affirmative role in the interaction. It was not often necessary to intervene to change the group's direction. It was necessary at times to focus diverse discussion or help make manifest some of the undercurrents of the interaction.

III. Content

The group was able to appropriately pick up material from the various speakers and integrate this content with their own experiences. They placed relatively little stress on specific techniques of teaching. The Bondi technique, for example, was not seriously adopted although IT DID SERVE TO HIGHLIGHT SOME TEACHER PRACTICES THAT COULD BE MODIFIED.

From their own backgrounds teachers were able to offer facts to supplement the material to which they had been exposed in the field of intergroup relationships. Similarly they talked about common prejudices that had been unconsciously accepted as fact and to critically review them. Facts on African and Afro-American history were particularly useful in helping both white and black teachers enlarge their perspectives.

IV. Rapport

Rapport among the group generally was high but this was not immediate. By their interaction the participants grew to see and then to accept one another as individuals rather than white or black.

This was more difficult for the white teachers who initially sat as a group and seemed quite anxious or insecure. As individuals, the four white teachers were basically constricted persons. All had fears and prejudices of which they were, for the most part, unaware. The two men stuck together as much because they were men as because they were white. One of them had been raised with rigid set of ethnic prejudices which he was able to talk about but, realistically, could not completely abandon at an emotional level. The two white female teachers were basically concerned and sympathetic toward the goals of the institute. Both had background which would have led to prejudiced thinking but they had, to a great extent, overcome them.

Several of the black teachers similarly had "hangups" they brought with them to the institute. Some of these were racial but mostly they had to do with class distinctions due to their own upbringing. Some appropriate modifications occurred in these areas.

Intergroup differences were appreciably diminished by ventilation and interaction. Group loyalty was apparent as participants compared their group (favorably, of course) to all the other groups in the institute. The feeling was expressed that the group maintain its identity in subsequent meetings.

V. Evaluation

The evaluative process was implicit throughout the discussions and terminated in an explicit discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the Institute as they saw them at that time. It was recognized that a more valid evaluation could be arrived at after they returned to the classroom in the Fall and had an opportunity to, first, test and observe their own, their peers's and their students' behaviors. They would be able to discuss these in evaluative sessions.

Most of the commendation of the Institute centered around the relevance of the samll group discussions to the goals of the Institute. Speakers and panelists also received some credit. The group leader was rated as excellent by all but two of the group -- significantly, the two white male teachers -- who rated him as good.

Criticism of the Institute focused on two main areas: pre-planning and laboratory experience. Participants felt that they should have been selected far in advance -- possible as early as January --, and that they should have been given reading assignments at that time in preparation for the Institute. They felt almost unanimously that of the summer program; and because some of the schools visited were insufficiently, or not at all, desegregated.

My own evaluation is in agreement with that of the group but, in addition, I felt that the goals of the Institute were too diverse. The goals encompassing attitudinal change and those concerned with teaching techniques were, in my opinion, too ambitious to both be achieved in the time available to the Institute.

VI. Recommendations

Some of these recommendations are a consequence of the group's evaluation, others are the leader's, several stem from analysis of both sources.

1. Laboratory experiences, if included, should be as relevant and non-repetitious as possible. The Kingsley House observation was an excellent example of integration at work. A few classrooms, both integrated and non-integrated, should be observed and compared. Where possible, the teachers should both observe and participate in the experience.
2. Speakers should be selected for their relevance to institute goals. All speakers should be available to the entire Institute after which the experience can be mulled over in the small group sessions.

3. Greater attention should be exercized as to heterogeneity of groups. Where possible these should be balanced by race, sex, age and experience.
4. The Institute should have one campus location rather than two. Students unanimously perferred Dillard to Tulane.
5. Opportunity for informal socialization should be built into the institute plan. A cocktail party would provide a necessary sense of satisfactory completion for the groups. One function might be planned for mid-way in the proceedings as an impetus to intergroup rapport.
6. Institute planning should include some former participants, as well as the seminar leaders. Appropriate materials and reading lists should be sent to prospective participants far in advance of the Institute.
7. The preparation of papers, except for credit students, should be discouraged. Oral book reports should be restricted to material outside of required reading so that the widest possible sharing of literature can be attained.

~~4~~ 8

8. Plans for stipends and reimbursement should be explicit and adhered to.
9. Sponsorship of the Institute should be outside the school system, for example: by an educational foundation, a professional organization, or a graduate school of education.
10. Training for group leadership might be offered by participants provided that a system can be devised whereby they can have planned meetings with their own faculties.
11. The follow-up evaluation should be carefully programmed for maximum benefit. It should not be extended beyond a single session unless additional material or opportunity for further interaction is introduced.

INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION
New Teachers

REPORT ON GROUP "A" ACTIVITIES RICHARD A. THEODORE

I. INTRODUCTION

In keeping with the purpose of this Institute, activities of the group were geared to increase the participants' awareness and understanding of problems occasioned by desegregation. Through the discussion of both factual information and opinions or personal views, the participants were encouraged to develop insight into these problems. An attempt was made to get the participants to indulge in a self appraisel of themselves in the desegregation process.

Selected activities aimed at involvement and interaction were employed to help the participants grow in their tolerance or acceptance of other ethnic groups and races and better understand the differences and similarities. Time was spent helping the participants to increase their ability to identify pupil behavior more accurately, thereby better enabling them to formulate approaches and possible solutions.

Easy formal and informal relationships among the participants were maintained in an effort to secure an honest level of communication. Hence, hopefully, the experiences of the

50

participants should lead them to an experssed desire to continue this type of activity during the coming year.

OBJECTIVES

In the initial sessions the following objectives were discussed as outlined in the syllabus.

1. Orientation: Identification of problems; formulation of individual project goals.
2. Sociological and psychological antecedents to learning.
3. Developing an effective instructional climate in desegregated situations.
4. The problem of evaluation and communication in desegregated teaching and learning.

From the discussion of the above objectives, participants expanded the scope of the discussions. For the purpose of indicating in a more specific way the scope of our Institute, the eight objectives as indicated in the syllabus for experienced teachers were used.

COMPOSITION OF THE SMALL GROUP

This group was made up of thirteen individuals. Significant aspects of this group are as follows:

a. Sex
    1. Six white females

        2. Six Negro females
        3. One white male
    b. Age
        1. Range (20-24 yrs.)-Eleven
        2. Range (30-35 yrs.)-One
        3. Range (45-50 yrs.)-One
    c. Educational Training
        1. Elementary Education-Five
        2. Secondary Education-Eight
    d. Teaching Experience
        1. Student teaching only-Eight
        2. Under five years-Two
        3. Over five years-Two
    e. Attendance (20 days including holiday)
        1. Average total hours per participant was 82 or 82 percent
        2. Dropout-One (No stated reason given).

SEMINAR PHASE (SMALL GROUP)

The activities began with a discussion of the objectives and possible activities that the participants might expect to engage in as indicated in the syllabus. Possible projects, as an individual endeavor were considered in the discussions. The participants appeared to embrace these objectives and looked forward with optimism, to the outcomes of the Institute. The small group was immediately accepted as a place where they could express themselves more freely.

As expected, communication was highly guarded during the first week. This was particularly true with respect to opinions about desegregation. However, the participants were more expressive about their pressing concerns upon entering a desegregated teaching situation. Quite often, questions such as the following were injected into the discussions.

1. To what extent do racial conflicts occur in the classroom or about the school?
2. What is the nature of these conflicts?
3. How will students of the other race accept me?
4. To what degree can I maintain discipline, particularly with respect to students of the other race?
5. How will the parents of students of another race accept and respect me as a teacher?
6. How will the staff and faculty relate to me?
7. To what degree will the Principal support and assist me as a beginner in learning to deal with problems in general as well as those of a racial nature?

Other areas were discussed, however the recurring or overriding concern of these new teachers appeared to be one of anxiety pertaining to general acceptance in a desegregated setting.

With respect to the above the sessions with the psychologist were very helpful. The psychologist concentrated upon helping selected individuals to better understand their feelings of anxiety. However, because of her very limited schedule, other areas of concern were not discussed with her.

It should be noted, that in general, the participants found having a psychologist was helpful in their gaining insight into behavior problems.

In the small group discussions the inexperienced teachers (8) took many opportunities to draw upon the experiences of the other participants. This proved to be helpful in moving the discussions along. The presence of experienced teachers in this group offered balance in the discussions, however, to a small degree these participants were too vocal. The inexperienced tended to yield to the more experienced members. It would appear from a Seminar Leader's point of view that the contact was good, however questionable on a continuous basis.

Along with the discussions some concern was expressed with respect to the projects and library work. Because of the composition and background of group members, a broad range of topics was considered. The approach employed here was one of giving the participants an open choice of topics and time to develop a project of maximum interest and benefit. This open, non-restrictive approach was troublesome to a few participants, but in general was well received by the majority. Verbally, participants expressed appreciation for the library time made available to them for reading. Concurrently, participants would have liked to share more of their reading with the small group. The limited time for small group discussions in general, was devoted to reacting to large group presentations.

The seminar phase, was as indicated in the participant evaluation the strongest and most beneficial aspect of the Institute. It was here that one could observe best, the interpersonal relationships which had evolved during the course of the Institute. During the last week a number of participants achieved a level of communication wherein they were impelled to discuss past personal experiences and bias and to indicate their commitment to the goals of this Institute. Discussions at this point, showed a marked change over the preceding weeks.

In concluding sessions, the participants, appeared reasonably agreed that the basic approach to desegregated situations is one of accepting people for what they are without racial distinctions. It was also, agreed, that as teachers, their efforts should be toward competence in working with all students

55

To further strengthen this phase of the Institute, concern should be given to the following:

a. Sub-groups to plan presentations to the group.
b. Require evidence of library work at intervals.
c. Allow time to discuss reading with the small group.
d. Provide more time for small group interaction.

It would seem from the experiences of the seminar phase each individual made a contribution and in return benefited from the discussions and the outside reading.

LARGE GROUP SESSIONS

These sessions consisted mainly of listening to speakers and reviewing films and filmstrips. For most of the speakers, a period of exchange of questions and answers followed for the large group. These discussion sessions enabled all the participants to share the questions and responses with the speaker and expedited the time of the speaker as well.

In general, the speakers made an important contribution in providing information to the participants on instructional problems and human relations in desegregated school situations. The speakers were knowledgable in the field of education, however most indicated some uncertainty about the basic objectives and activities of the Institute, which in turn, was conveyed to the participants.

The participants had a high regard for the presentations, but had some difficulty relating them to specific problems pertaining to desegregation. They expressed some concern that the speakers chose not to be specific on the nature and extent of problems in desegregated schools. Their concern is best understood, when considered with respect to the pressing questions indicated in the previous section. It should be noted that, understandably, the speakers were not familiar with the concerns of the participants, which indicates a need to provide speakers with more information on what is taking place.

With the above exception, the participants seemed to enjoy their interaction with all outside resource persons very much. The one two-hour session with the psychologist was very well received. The unfulfilled expectation of having a social worker was a disappointment to the group. It was, also noted that more speakers, outside the field of education, familiar with socio-economics or community problems be included in the Institute. It was felt these persons might assist participants in gaining a keener understanding of ethnic or class differences.

Films and filmstrips were shown to the participants on various topics such as, Negro history understanding minorities, teaching values and handling miscellaneous problems. Although, these films stimulated discussions or conversation within the group, in general, they were not well received with respect to content. In a few instances, it was hoped that these films would stand on their own merit, however, this did not happen, giving rise to a need for more carefully selecting them. The participants felt that the showing of films should be related to the discussions and expressed objectives.

To increase the effectiveness of this phase, the following appear to be necessary.

a. Adhere to a fixed schedule.
b. Improve coordination and continuity.
c. Increased participation of members.
d. Provide, for on-going evaluation of speakers and activities at intervals.

WORKSHOP

This phase included mainly observations in six schools participating in the AID summer program. The participants were received well by the coordinators and faculty and made welcome. The participants visited a given school once for several hours. They were encouraged to make observations in terms of their interest in classes being conducted. Much freedom was allowed in terms of classes to visit and the time spent in each one.

It was noted, immediately, that AID classes are highly individualized and not representative of the classes maintained in regular school sessions. The classes were small voluntary and well equipped with materials.

A number of interesting observations were made, however, the participants of this desegregation Institute did not feel they gained much. Reasons given were, that the level of desegregation was low and most of this group had recently completed observation and student teaching. The observance of involvement on the part of the participant was expressed also.

More careful planning for this phase was evident. It was very encouraging that participants expressed a desire for involvement in schools at some level, in order to gain more from their observations. Some indicated the possibility of teaching in laboratory schools in the morning and having the Institute in the afternoon with just compensation. Others would simply like to work with children on a limited basis during the Institute. In this case the schools should have a level of desegregation giving rise to problems of direct concern to a desegregation Institute.

In conclusion, the quality of the observations should improve both with respect to individual involvement and to the situation. It was generally agreed that some level of involvement on the part of the participant was necessary. Added fiscal support should be included.

57

CONCLUSION

The activities of this Institute did contribute to the progress gained in reaching the objectives. Most criticisms expressed were related mainly to supportive factors such as arrangements, schedule of time, speakers interpretation of their role in presentations, fiscal matters and general coordination. But, the more internal factors such as, the individual and group experiences (human relations) of the Institute were positive.

To the degree that contact and confrontation of ideas and opinions with individuals of different racial and ethnic groups are meaningful, here lies the more apparent success of the Institute. The inter-personal relationships, which tested our attitudes on desegregation were good for the development of every person in the Institute. And finally, the expressed need for an Institute of this type made available to more teachers and the desire to continue this kind of activity is significant.

FOLLOW-UP

This phase was discussed by the Seminar Leaders in detail and is being submitted separately as a joint response to the request for a planned follow-up.

The plan includes topics, arrangements, approaches and speakers for the five three-hour follow-up sessions.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT

As a Seminar Leader, this Institute has proved to be a very rewarding experience in working with a group. The involvment and interaction has contributed much to increasing my insight into inter-personal relationships and human behavior.

The broad study of problems relative to desegregation has increased my knowledge and understanding of the subject. Hopefully, I can make a more meaningful contribution to the students and staff in future school responsibilities. It is my considered opinion that Institutes of this type should be made available to many more persons.

61

INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION
New Teachers

REPORT ON GROUP "B" DR. A. K. M. PARIKH

Group B consisted of eleven members: six white ahd five Negroes. Three of the white members were experienced teachers who had 10 to 20 years of teaching experience. In the beginning of the Institute, they were the ones who were doing all the talking. However, as the group realized this one-sided communication, and as members came into closer contact with each other, the rest of the group became actively involved. The members shared experiences and ideas, and derived insights into behavior and feelings of the children and adults of the other race.

Large group presentations helped trigger small group discussions in some cases. In others there was not time available for such discussion. Speakers with experience in desegregated situations made good impressions on the members of my group. However, the majority of the speakers did not relate their discourses to desegregation and in that respect they did not contribute to the stated objectives of the Institute. It seems that many of them did not have specific interest or experience in desegregated situations.

62

Observation in public schools did not prove to be effective as the summer programs in those schools were of a special nature. Many of the schools visited were also not representative of the desegregation situations that the Institute evisaged.

On the whole, considering all the limitations, the Institute did make a significant contribution to the understanding of some of the problems of teaching in desegregated schools.

Suggestions for follow-up are given in a joint proposal prepared by the seminar leaders.

63

INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION
New Teachers

SUMMARY REPORT ON GROUP "C" (MRS.) DORIS DIETRICH

Primarily this report tends to deal with the activities and experience of Group "C", one of the three segments of the "new" teacher or recent graduate division. An attempt is made to describe: The characteristics of the group, procedure, content, and interaction in seminar sessions, and participation in large group activities. Evaluation and suggestions for modification for follow-up purposes are offered.

ANALYSIS OF SEMINAR PHASE

MEMBERSHIP

Identity and Observable Characteristics of Participants: Of Group "C" four teachers with prior experience do not fall in the category of recent graduates. Two of these were mature white women assigned during the 1968-69 session to tokenly integrated faculties of all black elementary schools. Of these two,one had five years teaching experience in an adjoining parish committed to maintaining segregation. This situation was responsible for her change of residence to Orleans Parish. The other trained as a social worker at the undergraduate level, spent the major part of her eighteen years of professional service as a nursery school director and teacher.

Because of basic philosophy of life, dedication to principles of integration, ethnic and background experience, both of these women contributed strength to Group "C". Their unequivocal description of the many faceted situations met with during the previous year, their frank discussion of interracial difficulties and their evident sincerity of purpose aimed at achieving solutions, encouraged less sophisticated members of Group "C" to verbalize and articulate.

In the order of length of experience the third, a younger white woman, had for two years served on faculties made up entirely of members of her own race. One of these years was a school with a slightly desegregated student body.

The fourth of this group had taught only one year with a desegregated faculty, instructing a predominantly Negro student body. The situation was fraught with racial tension. Participating in group processes as attempted at the seminar was a venture outside accustomed norm. So also must it have proven to be for five recently graduated Negro women teachers. Significantly, the total educational experience of these six teachers, elementary school through college, including student teaching, was in a segregated setting. Initially with these minority members a degree of uneasiness was communicated, although surface talk and behavior appeared normal and pleasant. Gradually they participated more actively in discussion, verbalizing their frustrations and venting their hostilities. Pairing off with members of the opposite race for special assignments eventualized in mixing with less and less restraint during coffee breaks and lunch periods. However, these six tended to establish their closer contacts with the older and more positively actuated Caucasian members of the group.

At the same time, a young man of the same race and with a similar educational background, having student taught on a perdominantly white faculty, with a supervising teacher and student body of the same extraction, displayed dissimilar characteristics. Although he entered the group at the beginning of the second week, from the onset he demonstrated a willingness and an ability to exchange ideas through participation in open discussion, to accept different opinions without antagonism, and to respond intellectually rather than emotionally to racially charged issues. It is recognized, of course, that factors other than contact with opposite race influenced his behavior. This young man was originally assigned to a school situation similar to his student teacher experience, but was later notified that his assignment was changed to a Negro race school.

Three of the young women received assignments to desegregated faculties with desegregated student bodies, another to a formerly all white faculty with a mixed student body. The first mentioned is returning to her same assignment. At the close of the Institute one of the five was yet unassigned.

The degree of anxiety and apprehension toward teaching assignment evidenced in group interaction equated proportionately to the dissimilarity of educational and ethnic background and anticipated teaching assignment. To illustrate: two recently graduated young white teachers educated in predominately white school, student teaching in similar situations, and assigned to the same type schools, verbalized fewer anxieties, racial or otherwise, and assumed a passive role within the group. However, this may have been an expression of inhibition, rather than apathy, stemming from limited prior inter-racial contact.

The thirteenth member, a mature white man with no previous teaching experience, recently received a degree from a predominantly all white out-of-state college. His assignment is to a Negro elementary school.

ACTIVITIES OF SEMINAR PHASE

Activities encompassed seminar meetings, observation in schools, library research, and individual counseling.

SEMINAR MEETINGS

Objectives of meetings were:

1. To involve teachers in identifying and clarifying areas of concern anticipated or experienced in desegregated

anticipated or experienced in desegregated school situations.

2. To make emergence of solutions and approaches to problem situations a group product. Further that such product come out of personal experience in the classroom, family and community relationships, philosophy of life and philosophy of education.

3. To compare conclusions of (2.) with findings as set fourth in literature of the field.

4. To provide a laboratory for gaining and applying skills in inter-racial experiences.

In attempting to achieve the above objectives, ten one and a half or two hour sessions were held. Current group dynamics practices and techniques were employed.

From time to time, brief meetings were held for disseminating information or giving notice of change of meeting place or scheduled activity, etc.

Teachers received individual counseling from seminar leaders as situation required.

Initially participants were asked to share with the group what each considered at that time to be his focus of anxiety or what he hoped to get from the Institute. After verbalization of anxieties and expectations each member was better able to select an area of research concentration.

An annotated bibliography was the only writing assignment required of each participant. Scholarship and reading accomplishment as reflected in the project submitted by each participant ranged from acceptable to excellent. The other requirements were regular attendance and active participation in all Institute sponsored activities. Two members applied for and received graduate credit.

CONTENT OF DISCUSSION

Library research project titles tended to peripherize discussion in desired areas. However, all topics could not receive in-depth or equal treatment as tendencies toward tangentile diffusion was evident after addresses by guest speakers or other stimulation. See Appendix number 12.

SAMPLE OF GROUP INTERACTION

The following posed situation recorded in notes taken during seminar meetings relative to the title, "Establishing Favorable Relationships with Adults Encountered in the Teaching Situation-Teachers, Administrators, Parents," will serve an an example of group reaction to questions brought up by participants.

Situation: One teacher, the minimal of token integration, is assigned to a previously all white faculty directing the activities of a desegregated student body.

Questions: How will I feel when entering this situation? Will I be accepted by faculty members? Will the principal support me if there is a conflict with teachers? With children? What about aggressive parents? What do parents want most for me?

MAIN IDEAS EMERGING FROM GROUP

Faculty Interaction: Importance of analysis of own feeling and behavior when weighing that of others.

Value of interpretation of reaction arising out of different background and life experience.

Need for understanding why people act the way they do.

Reaction will vary and degree of acceptance or rejection will be unpredictable. The greatest number to be encountered is those superficially prejudiced. Such have had some inter-racial contact with favorable reaction. These individuals are generally friendly and sociable with those of their own race and go overboard in being "nice." Some may idealize the minority. You may hear, "Some of my best friends are Negroes. Negroes are wonderful people." These believe they are completely unprejudiced, but their positive over-reaction most often reflects inner prejudice. They cannot understand why acceptance is not immediately forthcoming. However, slight a start will have been made and, hopefully, maturity in inter-racial relationship may eventualize. Fewer in number, fortunately, are those who purposely ignore and express negative attitude toward

70

personal association. Under a different set of circumstances this group might have gained the identity "white militants." It usually requires three score and ten years before the results of attempts to change this group are completed. Compensation will be found in association with those who will interact in a natural, cooperative manner, permitting normal personal involvement on a professional level.

The Principal: It is to remembered that the principal is responsible for effecting integration. He cannot disregard group differences and readiness to change, but must use reasoned firmness to support each individual teacher. He must handle each situation objectively and professionally. Mindful that overt verbal appeals to other faculty members to accept implies condescension, he may achieve mixing by appointments to committee or invitations to faculty lounge which preclude refusal.

Other Hints: Knowledgeableness before approaching principal with suggestions re: innovation, revision, implementation, etc. minimizes rejection of ideas. Observation of principal's contact with "others" may prove revelatory of effective approaches Defensive attitude toward inquiries on class progress or special incident, etc., is less productive of result than factual information.

Parental Contacts And Conferences: Contact parents before situation worsens. Positive attitudes are most productive in conference. Keep an open mind. Keep in mind that the "self fulfillment prophesy" is effective with parents as well as with their offspring. Never block avenues for the parent to save face. Listen, then stress how deviate behavior is damaging to child, not to you or parent. Don't verbalize on how much you care. Say something commendatory about the child before cricitism. Don't harp on misdemeanor. Instead, plan with parent and child corrective measures. To win the battle and lose the war is a pyrrhic victory at best. Parental initiated conferences based on legitimate complaint require admission of error. Parents expect competency in teachers.

Evaluation: Nearly all forms completed at the close of the activity phase of the Institute evaluated the small group sessions as being the most valuable and meaningful. The goals of the small group sessions, previously stated, were achieved to an appreciable degree, probably to a greater degree than individual members were aware. A summarization of negative verbal reaction by non-conformants such as : "This Institute didn't do a thing for me," "bored to death," "sick and tired of all those speeches and films," "and that library work," "all of it was just like we had in college," "tries to make it look like the Negro is at fault," "the only good I got out of it was meeting, talking to and making friends with some white teachers." Though the above comments were negative in intent, they strongly illustrate that over-all success along the lines of the institute intent was accomplished.

It is regrettable that the time allotment for small group sessions was not sufficient for utilization of role playing or socio-drama, recognized as effective techniques in group dynamics. Likewise, "Selection and preparation of instructional materials for racially mixed groups," one of the stated objectives listed in the syllabus was not accomplished.

Recommendations: Planning for future institutes should consider the value of daily small group sessions. The informal, carefully planned small group provides a setting for sustained interaction between majority and minority members. It serves as a laboratory in which participants not only gain new skills in inter-group relations, problem solving, and communication, but also providing the opportunity for applying concepts gained from speeches, field trips and other activities.

Basically to be meaningful, areas of concern for discussion should envolve from the group. However, pre-planning by seminar leaders in joint sessions would insure coverage of most important concepts and achieve better the goals of the Institute. This as well as selection of members has been discussed under appropriate headings.

Provisions should be made for recording and summarizing discussion of each meeting.

OBSERVATION

Analysis of teacher evaluation data indicates that observation in the schools was the least valuable experience of the

Institute. Summer programs available to the group in the main were not desegregated. Participants wanted exposure to situations they will meet in school assignments. In some schools that were visited, teachers were not prepared for visitors, resented the intrusion, or stopped teaching to visit or explain what they were doing. On two occasions, upon arrival at schools as pre-arranged, Institute members were advised that opportunities for field trips came up at the last minute and observational plans for Institute members had to be changed. This does not imply that visits were devoid of positive value. The group was received graciously at most schools, innovative approaches to teaching and new teaching materials and equipment were observed to a degree. The emphasis on the pleasurable aspects of learning and pupil involvement in science experiments at AID schools was worthy of emulation. In general, however, observation was not sustained or structured sufficiently to meet the needs of the Institute. Values gained were not in proportion to the time and energy expended.

Recommendations-Consideration could be given to establishing classrooms in two schools in differerent areas of the city which would utilize the services of new teachers, perhaps three classes. This plan would lend itself to a six weeks Institute.

If a more effective observational plan than that used by the Institute this summer cannot be devised, observation by means of film or video tape is suggested.

LIBRARY RESEARCH

A wide variety of reactions toward this phase of the Institute was expressed in written evaluation and verbally. Constant reference investigation required during the seminar underlines the importance of the library to adequate function of the Institute.

ANALYSIS OF LARGE GROUP PRESENTATIONS

Large group activities included listening and reacting to talks by recognized experts in education and related fields, instruction by audio-visual media, laboratory experience in innovative observational methods, and administration of evaluative and attitudinal studies.

SPEAKERS AND CONSULTANTS

Any attempt to give an accurate or detailed analysis of group reaction to speakers would be futile as verbal assessments were expanded versions of varied reaction recorded on written evaluation. While the more sophisticated and experienced teacher recognized that improvement in the instructional program was necessary adjunct in averting and alleviating problems associated with desegregation, the tendency among the emergent teacher was to regard dealing with increased teacher competency as repetition of college instruction. However, THERE WAS AGREEMENT IN GENERAL THAT MOST SPEAKERS

75

ASSIDUOUSLY AVOIDED THE TOPIC OF DESEGREGATION.

Listening and reacting to the psychiatrist, psychiatric social worker, and psychologist was a new experience for most teachers and elicited favorable comment. However, consensus was, that too few examples of deviating behavior and conflict situations were given. What teachers wanted was answers to, "What do you do when a child ....?" Similarly they felt that friction situations with adults encountered in a desegregated setting should have been more exhaustively commented on by the psychologist. The positive reaction arising out of the one visit of the psychologist and the visit of the social worker with the small group suggests the value of increased exposure to such resource persons.

Feedback included frequent remarks that the "disadvantaged child" was the sole focus of attention. As one young woman irately stated, "I'm tired of hearing about disadvantaged children all my life. I don't have to listen to talks about them or look at films to learn about them. All I have to do is look out my front door and I'll see all I want to see. I want to learn about the other kind and mix with them. That's why I became a teacher."

Presentations which seemed to be most meaningful to the teachers were the panel, "Problems Encountered in the Desegregated Setting-Point of View" and "Language Patterns in the

Classroom-Approaches to More Effective Communication." The first "told it like it is" and the second spoke to a recognized need.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Descriptions of minority culture and characteristic classroom behavior of disadvantaged minority children seemed appropriate that a concerted effort be made to use minority members as factual resource persons in reporting and interpreting on the diversity of the life styles of the Negro, his sensitivity toward feeling "left out," and his "shortcomings" as viewed by the majority.

Speakers from other segments of society and the community, rather than just school affiliated people, would furnish coverage. Representatives from New Orleans Institute on Desegregation, the Social Welfare Planning Committee, and Total Community Action are examples. Parents, representatives of different soci-economic strata, should be included. The group saw an excellent example of capable parental leadership demonstrated at Phillips School.

In light of the above a list of suggested titles for future speakers follows. Notes are included when title is not inclusive of area to be covered.

1. "The Language of Prejudice-How to Avoid Offending"

2. "How to Avoid the Discrimination Trap" Equality of treatment does not mean treating everybody the same. Cultural differences must be recognized.

3. Discipline: "Managing Surface Behavior" Handling Friction Incidents with Children." Personal hostility and intergroup antagonism. Ability to distinguish between situational conflict and racial incident.

4. "Importance of Sustained Interaction Between Races" Communication important. How? Role of administrator in school setting.

5. "The Psychology of Punishment"

6. "Teachers-Students of Behavior" Understanding why people act the way they do increases ability to cope with problem. Different levels of problems should be discussed. Which can the teacher handle? The counselor? When is referral for professional help necessary?

7. "The Teacher as Counselor" What do you say to a child-he is failing a subject-he has felt the sting of discrimination-prejudice? Called a derogatory name? Victim of dishonesty?

8. "Don't Win the Battle and Lose the War-Parental Contacts and Conferences."

9. "Building the Child's Self-Concept" Praise, important in this area and frequently overdone, should be throughly covered

78

APPENDIX II

A. OPINION STUDY

B. ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

C. CHANGE ANALYSIS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS

A. OPINION STUDY
1969

Identifying symbol __________

This is a study of what you at this moment think about some social and educational questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write in +1, +2, or +3; or -1, -2, or -3, depending on how you feel in each case. If you have mixed feelings, mark the statement with a zero (0).

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE -1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH -2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH
0: I AM UNCERTAIN

PERCENTAGES (Pre-Test above, Post-Test below)

+	0	-		
38 18	3 3	59 80	1.	Many personality traits such as honesty, sense of rhythm, and imaginativeness have been shown to be associated with racial characteristics.
65 74	9 9	27 18	2.	Human nature being what it is, there will always be poverty and deadbeats.
62 68	21 9	18 21	3.	There is no scientific reason whatsoever to make our immigration laws stricker for one people than for another.
74 59	6 0	21 41	4.	Obedience and respect for authority and for the law are the most important virtues children should learn.
27 9	27 12	47 80	5.	Intelligence tests results show that differences between races are greater than individual differences between people of the same race.
27 15	12 12	62 74	6.	Zootsuiters and beatnicks prove that when young people of their type have too much freedom, they just take advantage and cause trouble.
15 12	15 18	71 71	7.	There are some racial groups of man whose gens are mutually incompatible as far as intermarriage is concerned.
9 9	0 0	91 77	8.	Negro Americans and Spanish American have their rights, but it may be best to keep them in their own districts and schools.

PERCENTAGES			
+	0	-	
74 62	9 21	18 18	9. If the most intelligent, imaginative, energetic and emotionally stable third of mankind were to be selected all races would be about equally represented.
41 35	9 3	50 59	10. A person who has bad manners, habits, and speec can hardly be expected to get along with decent people.
3 3	3 6	97 91	11. The Negro's skin is harder to keep clean than the white man's skin.
41 35	3 9	56 50	12. What alienated youth needs most strick discipline and the will to work
56 74	3 3	44 24	13. The idea that opportunities in the United Statc are open equal to all individuals of equal ability must be regarded as a fantasy.
0 3	3 6	97 91	14. It would be a mistake generally to have Negroes as foreman, administrators, or political leader over the white majority in America.
3 0	6 3	91 94	15. Young people of Mexican extraction are not as capable of intellectual achievement as are students of Anglo-Saxon parentage.
24 15	12 15	65 71	16. I can hardly imagine my best friend marring a minority person.
18 6	3 6	80 88	17. The Negro's order is a racial characteristic.
35 35	6 15	59 50	18. Young minorities sometimes get rebellious idea but as they grow up they ought to get over the and settle down.
0 3	3 9	97 88	19. Race mixture produces biologically inferior offspring.
27 38	18 9	56 53	20. There may be individual exceptions, but in general, minority groups in America are pretty much alike.
24 24	9 9	68 68	21. Mongoloids, Caucasians, Spanish, and Negroes can be distinguished by their emotional charac teristics and personality traits.

PERCENTAGES				
+	0	-		
32 32	27 27	41 41	22.	Nowdays, more and more people are prying into family matters that should remain personal and private.
0 6	9 6	91 88	23.	Pure-blooded members of a race are superior in native ability to half-breeds.
9 3	18 6	74 91	24.	The trouble with letting Negroes into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typically Negro atmosphere.
27 12	9 12	65 77	25.	Even if all racial groups had equal environments, it is no very probable that their average mental accomplishments would also be equalized.
21 15	15 21	65 65	26.	The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, especially among lower socio-economic groups.
18 9	9 18	74 74	27.	It has been demonstrated that racial groups differ fundamentally in their ability to adapt themselves to a new culture and to make contributions to it.
27 15	21 24	56 62	28.	The true American way of life is disappearing so fast that strong measures may be necessary to preserve it.
24 35	18 6	74 59	29.	Culturally the colored races are superior to the white race in many important respect.
9 9	3 3	88 88	30.	To try to end the prejudice against Negroes, the first step is for the Negroes to sincerely try to get rid of their harmful and irritating faults and habits.
0 0	21 15	80 85	31.	Irregular sex activities amongst Negroes is a consequence of their greater natural sex urge.
3 0	0 0	97 100	32.	Most Negro adolescents would become aggressive and disagreeable if not colsely controlled.
29 21	12 15	59 65	33.	Some racial groups are naturally aggressive, while others are naturally peaceable.

PERCENTAGES +	 0	 -		
9 12	12 12	80 77	34.	Familiarity breeds contempt in working with minority groups.
74 80	15 3	12 18	35.	Frustration results in some form of aggression.
65 56	0 0	35 44	36.	It is essential for learning or effective work with the disadvantaged that our teachers outline in detail what is to be done and exactly how to go about it.
15 6	9 6	77 88	37.	A newborn white infant brought up by Australian aborigines would differ to some extent in mentality and behavior from the natives as a whole because of his race.
44 44	6 0	50 53	38.	Books, TV, and movies ought not to deal so much with the unpleasant and seamy side of life; they ought to concentrate on themes that are uplifting.
50 59	9 3	35 38	39.	Race prejudice in the United States is sociall sanctioned and socially accepted.
38 27	18 15	41 59	40.	Among disadvantaged learners a teacher can expect three out of four to have less than average intelligence.
62 53	27 35	12 12	41.	A heightened cultural development is often found in association with race mixture.
77 53	0 12	24 32	42.	Parents of disadvantaged children tend to show less concern than do middle class parents over their children's scholastic achievement.
9 12	18 29	74 56	43.	Fate seems to play a more important role in a person's life than it did some years ago.
74 80	3 12	24 9	44.	Present intelligence tests have a definite bias against minority children.
74 50	9 15	21 35	45.	A lower class youngster tends to place more emphasis on "belonging to a gang" than does the middle class youngster.

PERCENTAGES +	0	-	
41	12	44	46. Experienced teachers have a fairly adequate understanding of the family life of typical disadvantaged learners.
27	15	59	
24	27	47	47. Present day adolescents value music with a lower class genesis rather than that with a middle class genesis.
27	35	38	
88	3	6	48. In general, disadvantaged learners are more effective with non-verbal problems than with verbal ones.
77	15	9	
41	24	35	49. Nobody tells me what to do is more a lower class adolescent concept.
32	9	59	
27	0	74	50. Disadvantaged learners are less creative then middle class learners.
6	3	91	
91	6	3	51. Lower class fathers tend to become less involved in school related matters than lower class mothers.
88	9	6	
59	18	21	52. In general teachers of the disadvantaged do not bring the out-of-school experiences of the students to bear on classroom work.
62	9	29	
18	62	15	53. The factor of pathology looms larger in middle class adolescent delinquency than it does in lower class adolescent delinquency.
21	55	12	
12	0	88	54. Under present conditions it is almost impossible for teachers of the disadvantaged to utilize the social backgrounds of these students in the teaching-learning process.
3	9	85	
24	44	29	55. In pluralistic societies prejudice tends to be less serve.
32	44	28	
59	3	35	56. The school will have served its purpose if we teachers some way can help fit the disadvantaged into the American way of doing things.
47	6	41	
80	6	18	57. Prejudice deserves more treatment in our education than it usually receives.
85	3	12	

PERCENTAGES				
+	0	-		
50 68	12 6	35 27	58.	In general, teachers could do a better job if the culture diversity in school and the classroom could be reduced.
65 56	9 9	29 35	59.	Juvenile delinquency should be looked upon primarily as adolescent maladjustment.
80 88	3 3	21 9	60.	Most teachers of the disadvantaged have an inadequate picture of the positive elements in the cultural heritage of the disadvantaged.
35 32	12 6	56 59	61.	Much of juvenile delinquency is caused by working mothers.
47 50	27 29	29 21	62.	Social welfare has the same right to public tax monies as do the public schools.
56 47	3 3	35 50	63.	Helping the disadvantaged youngsters to be more successful in their school work is the most important job a teacher can perform.
35 50	18 6	44 32	64.	My professional needs in this Institute in the do not include much work with a cooperating teacher in a compensatory education classroom this summer.
47 50	15 6	32 44	65.	My work as a teacher would be more valuable if I could reduce the differences in my learners from me.
0 21	94 68	0 0	66.	The passage of proposition 14 in California was a needed change in human relations and government
41 35	9 6	50 59	67.	It is fallacious to believe that the government can do something the people cannot do for themselves.
50 50	18 24	32 27	68.	The drift in American toward a welfare state is sapping the moral fiber of the people.
77 85	6 3	12 12	69.	A good teacher, generally speaking, will tend to be a good teacher also of the disadvantaged
88 77	0 6	9 18	70.	A successful teacher of the disadvantaged must possess special attitudes.

PERCENTAGES				
+	0	-		
65 65	9 21	24 15	71.	Dependence on social welfare is becoming a way of life for far too many people in America.
65 82	6 3	27 15	72.	The purposes of education must be changed to bring good education to the disadvantaged.
32 41	18 15	50 44	73.	In American the best teachers of the culturally different learner tend to come from that culture.
68 74	12 6	21 21	74.	It would be a mistake to allow secondary students to call their teachers by their first names.
62 74	3 3	27 24	75.	A teacher needs more empathy to work successfully with the disadvantaged than with the middle class learner.
44 24	6 9	50 65	76.	Most disadvantaged families do not really know what they want out of life.
38 24	6 0	56 74	77.	Most disadvantaged have but few values they are willing to live by.
15 9	0 0	82 91	78.	Poverty is fairly accurate sign of failure in life.
29 24	3 6	68 71	79.	Poor people will generally take advantage of society if given the opportunity.
41 38	0 3	59 59	80.	Teachers in depressed areas can expect little parent cooperation in school problems.
21 21	12 3	65 77.	81.	The disadvantaged tend to be loud, vulgar, and impolite.
85 88	6 3	9 9	82.	The disadvantaged should have something to say about the kind of education offered them.
82 88	6 6	12 6	83.	Most poor people are willing to work hard if given the opportunity.
24 24	9 3	68 74	84.	Disadvantaged learners seem unwilling to work as hard as other learners.
18 18	44 32	38 50	85.	In general, social agencies are too lenient in their clients.

PERCENTAGES +	0	-	
56	15	29	86. Because of the numerous similarities in the backgrounds of the disadvantaged, they in school tend to be a more homogeneous group than the others.
38	12	50	
32	29	32	87. It is questionable as to whether our schools should be pushed into social welfare concerns.
24	42	32	
44	6	53	88. In general, the responsibility for educational change must rest more on the shoulder of individual teachers.
29	3	68	
41	12	50	89. The most successful teachers of the disadvan aged seem to be born with a certain "knack."
32	6	59	
50	12	41	90. The best way to deal with the educational problems of the disadvantaged would seem to be to create special classes for them.
24	12	65	
29	9	62	91. It would seem to be better if education could have less interference from the public
27	9	65	
18	6	74	92. Various cultural groups have unique biologically induced body odors.
15	6	80	
91	3	3	93. Sociologist and cultural anthropologist are generally agreed that among the middle class American society there exists a rather large number of clearly defined stable values and consistent practices.
71	15	15	
24	24	53	94. Class differences with in racial minorities groups tend to be less than are the differences within the Caucasian majority.
18	29	53	
62	0	11	95. Education is free enough now in America society that anyone who really wants it can get it somehow.
74	6	21	
15	6	80	96. Groups wishing to be truly integrated into American society should subordinate their cultural origins and adopt our uniquely American way of life.
9	6	85	
35	15	44	97. School cooperation with social agencies rest primarily on the social agencies providing the materials and information teachers need.
38	21	41	

PERCENTAGES				
+	0	-		
18 18	65 53	15 27	98.	In the area of social welfare, private agencies seem to do a better job than the tax supported agencies.
3 6	77 71	18 15	99.	It is generally agreed that the major function of agencies such as the California Youth Authority which runs Chino is that of punishment of offenders against society.
29 27	6 18	68 56	100.	Corporal punishment is sometimes an acceptable method of dealing with a disadvantaged learner.
12 12	18 24	71 65	101.	If desegregation were to result in more mixed marriages, I would be against it.
38 47	47 27	15 24	102.	More white males "exploit" Negro females than Negro males "exploit" white females.
18 6	21 15	62 74	103.	I have found that relatively fewer disadvantaged children can be trusted than middle class children.
6 3	3 3	91 91	104.	In physical education activities like folk or ballroom dancing it is perhaps best to pair minority children rather than mix students of different backgrounds.
77 91	6 0	18 6	105.	It is time that the school take the lead in making American ideals real by mixing varied backgrounds in all varieties of academic and social activities.
62 71	6 3	32 27	106.	In order to realize the ideal of a single, basic American culture shared all social strata.
38 32	35 27	27 41	107.	Bright lower class Negro children tend to have more negative attitudes toward their external environment than do average lower class Negro children.
47 41	9 6	44 53	108.	In dealing with the disadvantaged, the teacher generally must be a little more authoritarian than with other learners.

PERCENTAGES				
+	0	-		
29	24	47	109.	The Watts Riots did irresparable harm to the cause of disadvantaged groups in America.
27	24	50		
21	0	77	110.	School people should request Mexican-American learners not to speak Spanish among themselves on the school grounds.
24	12	65		
6	6	85	111.	The very fact that a Mexican-American child may be bi-lingual tends to cause school failure.
18	0	82		
21	6	74	112.	Other thins being equal, a teacher working with the disadvantaged needs stability more than adaptability.
21	9	71		
53	27	24	113.	Negro counselors and advisors tend to reveal in general the same attitudes toward disadvantaged learners as do white counselors and advisors.
47	29	24		
24	15	56	114.	Much of the prejudice that minority children feel directed at them by teachers and other students is largely imaginary.
29	3	68		
71	3	27	115.	Education of the disadvantaged should aim primarily at helping them to function better in their position in the social structure rather than to emulate the middle class functioning.
85	3	12		

B. ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Opinion Study 1969

Correct responses were defined as "what the response should have been." For example, in item 1, the response for an impartial person would have been -3. In item 3, the correct response would have been +3. These evaluations were made by the Staff.

Items related to Economics and government yielded more incorrect responses than items relating to human relationships and race which yielded more positive responses. The responses might have reflected staff orientation and race, or, in reality, reflected objectives of the Institute.

In consideration of responses, Seminar Leaders and participants gave certain value judgments about the items on the questionnaire. Some items were said to be prejudicial, others were enlightened yet others were considered amusing. Further, Seminar Leaders considered some items permissive, rigid, authoritarian, and conservative.

Category I (Race)

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Responses	459	58.92
Incorrect Responses	92	11.81
Undecided	125	16.05
No response	103	13.22
Total	779	100%

Category II (Economics and Government)

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Responses	49	31.82
Incorrect Responses	50	32.47
Undecided	24	15.58
No Response	31	20.13
Total	154	100 %

Category III (Education)

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Responses	265	44.16
Incorrect Responses	141	23.50
Undecided	88	14.67
No Response	106	17.67
Total	600	100 %

Category IV (Human Relations)

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Rosponses	211	54.10
Incorrect Responses	68	17.44
Undecided	47	12.05
No Response	64	16.41
Total	390	100 %

Category V (Intelligence)

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Responses	44	47.31
Incorrect Responses	23	24.73
Undecided	13	13.98
No Response	13	13.98
Total	93	100 %

Category VI (Social Class)

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Responses	257	39.06
Incorrect Responses	192	29.17
Undecided	100	15.20
No Response	109	16.57
Total	658	100 %

Category VII (Emotions)

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Responses	29	48.34
Incorrect Responses	12	20.00
Undecided	7	11.66
No Response	12	20.00
Total	60	100 %

Category VIII (Behavior)

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Responses	195	54.17
Incorrect Responses	67	18.61
Undecided	40	11.11
No Response	58	16.11
Total	360	100 %

Category IX (Miscellaneous)

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Responses	33	36.67
Incorrect Responses	24	26.67
Undecided	18	20.00
No Response	15	16.66
Total	90	100 %

Total Responses

	Number	Per Cent
Correct Responses	1542	48.43
Incorrect Responses	669	21.01
Undecided	462	14.51
No Response	511	16.05
Total	3184	100 %

C. CHANGE ANALYSIS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS

Items Reflecting Significant Percentage of Change

AGREEMENT %			DISAGREEMENT %	
PRE TEST	POST TEST		PRE TEST	POST TEST
		33 Percentage points of change 5. Intelligence test results show that differences between races are greater than individual differences between people of the same race.	47	80
50	24	26 Percentage points of change 90. The best way to deal with the educational problems of the disadvantaged would seem to to create special classes for them.		
77	53	24 Percentage points of change 42. Parents of disadvantaged children tend to show less concern than do middle class parents over their children's scholastic achievement		
		24 Percentage points of change 49. Nobody tells me what to do is more a lower class adolescent concept than a middle class adolescent concept.	35	59
74	50	24 Percentage points of change 45. A lower class youngster tends to place more emphasis on "belonging to a gang" than does the middle class youngster.		
		21 Percentage points of change 1. Many personality traits such as honesty, sense of rhythm, and imaginativeness have been shown to be associated with racial characteristics.	59	80

AGREEMENT %			DISAGREEMENT %	
PRE TEST	POST TEST		PRE TEST	POST TEST
27	6	21 Percentage points of change 50. Disadvantaged learners are less creative then middle class learners.		
		21 Percentage points of change 86. Because of the numerous similarities in the backgrounds of the disadvantaged, they in school tend to be a more homogeneous group than the others.	29	50
91	71	20 Percentage points of change 93. Sociologist and cultural anthropologist are generally agreed that among the middle class in American society there exists a rather large number of clearly defined stable values and consistent practices.		
44	24	20 Percentage points of change 76. Most disadvantaged families do not really know what they want out of life.		
		20 Percentage points of change 4. Obedience and respect for authority and for the law are the most important virtures children should learn.	21	41
		18 Percentage points of change 40. Among disadvantaged learners a teacher can expect three out of four to have less than average intelligence.	41	59
50	68	18 Percentage points of change 58. In general, teachers could do a better job if the culture diversity in school and the classroom could be reduced.		

AGREEMENT % PRE TEST	AGREEMENT % POST TEST		DISAGREEMENT % PRE TEST	DISAGREEMENT % POST TEST
		18 Percentage points of change	56	74
		77. Most disadvantaged have but few values they are willing to live by.		
		17 Percentage points of change	74	91
		24. The trouble with letting Negroes into a nice neighborhood is that gradually give it a typically Negro atmosphere.		
65	82	17 Percentage points of change		
		72. The purposes of education must be changed to bring good education to the disadvantage.		
27	12	15 Percentage points of change		
		25. Even if all racial groups had equal environments, it is not very probable that their average mental accomplishments would also be equalize.		
		15 Percentage points of change		
		29. Culturally the colored races are superior to the white race in many important respects.	74	59
		15 Percentage points of change		
		44. Present intelligence test have a definite bias against minority children.	24	9
		15 Percentage points of change		
		46. Experienced teachers have a farily adequate understanding of the family life of typical disadvantaged learners.	44	59
		15 Percentage points of change	35	50
		63. Helping the disadvantaged youngsters to be more successful in their school		

AGREEMENT %			DISAGREEMENT %	
PRE TEST	POST TEST		PRE TEST	POS1 TES1
		work is the most important job for a teacher can perform.		
		15 Percentage points of change		
		88. In general, the responsibility for educational change must rest more on the shoulders of administrators than on the shoulders of individual teachers.	53	68
		14 Percentage points of change		
71	85	115. Education of the disadvantaged should aim primarily at helping them to function better in their position in the social structure rather than to emulate the middle class functioning.		

OPINION STUDY
1969

Analysis and Appraisal of Statements Showing Significant Percentage of Change between Pre and Post Test

NUMBER OF ITEM	
	I. Characteristics of Children
	A. Intelligence
5,44	1. Tests
40	2. Teacher expectations (disadvantaged)
25	3. Environmental influences (all racial groups)
1	B. Personality Traits-Race Related
50	C. Creativity-Related to Class
	II. Values
49	A. Adolescent's acceptance of authority
45	B. "Belonging to gang"
93	C. Stability of middle class
76	D. Undetermined goals (disadvantaged)
4	E. Importance of accepting respect for authority (all classes)
77	F. Lower standard of disadvantaged
29	G. Belief in racial superiority
	III. Teacher Attitude and Behavior
46	A. Necessity of familiarity with background of disadvantaged
88	B. Acceptance of responsibility for educational change
	IV. Goals of Education
*72	A. Need for change in favor of disadvantaged

NUMBER OF ITEM	
63	B. Priority suggested in teaching "school work"
115	C. Disadvantaged functioning in current class strata
	V. Educational Approaches-Grouping
90	A. Special Classes for disadvantaged
*58	B. Reduced cultural deversity
	VI. Family and Community
42	A. Parental concern-achievement
86	B. Background (disadvantaged) factor in fostering homogeniety
24	C. Desegregated housing

Note: Where applicable statements refer to "social and economic class," terminology "lower class," "minority" and disadvantaged is consistently used in making comparison with "middle class."

In the opinion of analysts (group leaders) change was in favorable direction except in two areas. These are items 72 and 58 and are indicated with an asterisk (*).

APPENDIX III

DESEGREGATION CHECKLIST AND TABULATION

TEACHERS DESEGREGATION CHECKLIST

First Checklists mailed by the author contained only two categories; Yes-No. The latter set mailed to us used three categories: Not at all, Somewhat, and To a great extent. We used the categories, Yes and No.

TEACHERS' DESEGREGATION CHECKLIST

Among the most pressing problems facing education today in all parts of the country are those related to school desegregation. Although the burden of solving the resultant problems rests upon the whole community, particularly severe demands are being made on school officials and teachers. They have a special responsibility to afford each child a maximum opportunity to profit from his educational experience, as well as to promote greater human understanding.

The problems occasioned by school desegregation are always complex and require comprehensive analysis and approach if adequate solutions are to be found. It is often difficult for those most immediately involved to give attention to specific details while maintaining an overall view of the many different and varied aspects of the problem.

The following checklists provide guides by which school officials and teachers can quickly analyze their efforts to provide the best educational experiences possible for all the students under their responsibility as they move toward a unitary school system. Each question should be answered by placing the appropriate number - 1, 2, or 3 - in the space provided to the left. A number "1" suggests that little or no effort has been made to initiate or carry out the activity. Number "2" suggests that some consideration has been given to the activity but no thorough approach has been taken. A number "3" would indicate that everything possible was being done to carry out the activity.

not at all	somewhat	to a great extent
(1)________	________(2)________	________(3)

No Yes

By permission of H. Larry Winecoff, Director
South Carolina School Desegregation Consulting Center
University South Carolina, Columbia, S. C. 29208

Increasing school desegregation often results in new challenges and difficulties for the classroom teacher, or, at the least, aggravates perennial problems and adds new dimensions to old challenges. In most cases the teacher will accept a desegregated classroom with good will and the desire to meet the common and individual needs of all his students. However, more than good will and desire are necessary.

The perceptive and sensitive teacher soon learns that in the desegregated classroom, especially the newly desegregated classroom, he is forced to reexamine not only his methods and materials, but also his own attitudes and values. Not infrequently he may have to reevaluate and give new force and direction to his commitment to bring out the full potential of each student, as an individual and a group member. He learns anew the debilitating effect that cultural deprivation can have on a child. He may see, first hand, how the segregation or exclusion of a particular minority group or race from the mainstream of the national or regional culture can adversely affect the self-concept and self-worth of minority children. He may see how the arbitrarily forced separation of peoples can produce not only ignorance of one another, but also suspicions, prejudices and harmful stereotypes, insensitivity to the needs and feeling of others, or hypersensitivity and resentment over trivial or imagined wrongs. Hopefully, he will note how these factors hinder the intellectual, emotional and social growth of his students.

This checklist is offered as a guide for self-exploration by the teacher. It may help him meet, more effectively and successfully, the needs and difficulties of all the children in his desegregated classroom, and creatively transform an initially troublesome situation into a richer opportunity to develop the full potential of his students. Using the three point scale, a total score approaching 75 would seem to indicate that the teacher is moving positively and effectively to meet the problems and challenges of school desegregation. Some of the questions in the checklist may be more pertinent to certain subject areas than to others. However, all teachers, regardless of subject area, should answer all the questions as honestly as possible.

Checklist for Classroom Teachers

___ 1. Can you identify the human problems that block or hinder open and honest communication between yourself and your principal, your fellow teachers, and your students?

___ 2. Does your classroom conduct inspire your students to respect one another and be open and honest in their communications with you and with other students?

___ 3. Have you read any books or articles lately to increase your understanding of and sensitivity to the particular aspirations, needs, problems, and frustrations of minority or disadvantaged group?

___ 4. Have you worked directly and indirectly, to dispell misconceptions, stereotypes, prejudices and other adverse feelings that members of one group have against members of another group?

___ 5. Do you take the initiative in dispelling prejudices, stereotypes and misunderstandings among students?

___ 6. Do you listen with an open mind to students and faculty members of other groups, even if their communications are initially disturbing or divergent from your own thinking?

___ 7. Do you strive to avoid expressions and actions which are unnecessarily offensive to members of other groups?

___ 8. Do you take the initiative in discouraging or preventing pattens of informal discrimination, segregation, or exclusion of minority group members from school clubs, committees, etc.

___ 9. Do you utilize techniques and methods, such as improvisational dramatics role-playing, joint planning of programs by teachers and students, small group sensitivity discussions, analysis of group roles, that will increase spontaneity and honesty of expression, and an understanding of the dynamics of group interaction?

___ 10. Are you aware that group prejudices and antagonisms might be reinforced by homogeneous or ability grouping, and have you taken steps to prevent this reinforcement?

___ 11. Are your teaching methods and materials appropriate for minority students, culturally disadvantaged students and slow learners?

___ 12. Do you occasionally check yourself to be sure that latent prejudices or stereotyped thinking does not unfairly influence your discipline or evaluation of students?

___ 13. Does your outside reading assignment include accounts of all races and interracial experiences, and are you familiar with bibliographies containing such readings?

___ 14. Have you checked with your school librarian to learn how much material of this type is available in your school library?

___ 15. Do you show Negro as well as white family groups in your bulletin board displays?

___ 16. Do displays of work and play groups show Negro and white people working and playing together?

___ 17. Do your classroom pictures of great people include Negroes as well as whites?

___ 18. Have you discarded pictures or posters that reinforce Negro stereotypes or stereotypes of minority groups?

___ 19. Do you occasionally look through such magazines as *Ebony* and *Jet* to obtain appropriate pictures of Negroes that can be used in classroom displays?

___ 20. Do your pictures of cities include depressed areas as well as high-rise apartments and pretty houses?

___ 21. Do you use magazine and newspaper articles relating to interracial experiences and problems that can be discussed in class for better human relations?

___ 22. Do your pictures and posters create a sympathetic awareness of disadvantaged children and groups?

___ 23. Have you evaluated your textbooks to determine whether they contain fair and appropriate treatment of minority groups?

___ 24. Have you made efforts to overcome the deficiencies of your textbooks' treatment of minority groups?

___ 25. Do your students have opportunities to learn democratic skills and values by interacting in problem-solving groups?

___ 26. Do you use problem-solving groups which concern themselves with real problems in intergroup relations which have immediate relevance to the lives of the students?

___ 27. Do you organize and present your material (units of work) to include major contributions of minority groups and individuals?

___ 28. Have you visited or otherwise personally familiarized yourself with the families and communities of your students?

___ 29. Have you made efforts to involve the parents or guardians of your students in school activities?

___ 30. Have you attempted to establish and maintain some meaningful contact and dialog with the parents, guardians and communities from which your students come?

Tally Sheet

TEACHERS' DESEGREGATION CHECK LIST

	Yes	No		Yes	No
1.	24		16.	13	8
2.	23	1	17.	15	7
3.	25		18.	14	8
4.	22	2	19.	14	6
5.	25		20.	13	9
6.	25		21.	13	8
7.	24	1	22.	15	5
8.	21	1	23.	21	
9.	16	6	24.	20	3
10.	18	4	25.	19	2
11.	22	2	26.	16	4
12.	19	3	27.	17	4
13.	18	6	28.	20	2
14.	13	9	29.	21	2
15.	14	7	30.	23	1

Tabulations of Responses from
Experienced Teachers

There were thirty participants but some did not respond to items which they felt were inapplicable.

APPENDIX IV

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

INSTITUTE FOR THE TRAINING TEACHERS IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

Evaluation Form

Name ______________________ Group I II III
(Circle one)

Place a check beside the appropriate response to each of the following items:

1) Level: elementary ___
secondary ___
college ___

2) Position: teacher ___
administrator, ___
guidance counselor
supervisor _____
other ____

3) Years of professional experience:
0 ___
1-3 ___
4-6 ___
7-9 ___
10-15 ___
16-21 ___
21 or more ____

4) Race: Negro _____ White _____

5) Age:
20-24 _
25-29 _
30-34
35-39 _
40-44 _
45-49 _
50-54 _
55-59 _
60 or more ___

6) Sex: Male ___ Female _____

7) Experience in racially mixed schools:

a) During 1968-69 did you work with a racially mixed faculty?
Yes ___ No ___

b) Prior to 1968 how many years did you work with a racially mixed faculty? ______

c) During 1968-69 did you teach a racially mixed class? Yes_ No_

d) Previous to 1968 how many years did you teach a racially mixed class? _____

108

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTE

Please answer each of the following questions, using the four point scale to the right (1-unsatisfactory; 2-poor; 3-good ; 4-excellent). Circle the number which most nearly represents your opinion.

1)	I would generally apprasie the Institute as being:	1)	1	2	3	4
2)	To what extent do you feel that each of the following goals of the Institute was achieved:					
a)	to familiarize the teacher with life circumstances of pupils in order to establish rapport necessary for effective training.	2a	1	2	3	4
b)	to make education meaningful through the presentation of subject matter, so that it is relevant to their life experiences.	b)	1	2	3	4
c)	to prepare teachers in newly desegregated schools to cope with unfamiliar situations.	c)	1	2	3	4
d)	to help teachers accept people as having individual merit.	d)	1	2	3	4
e)	to promote understanting between the races by providing avenues of communication.	e)	1	2	3	4
f)	to provide teachers with additional skills and sensitivities needed to work with and overcome classroom problems associated with desegregation.	f)	1	2	3	4
g)	to provide a laboratory in which participants gain and apply skills of human relations, communication, and problem solving.	g)	1	2	3	4

3) I would evaluate each of the speakers as follows:

a)	Dr. Bondi	3a)	1	2	3	4
b)	Mrs. Boucree	b)	1	2	3	4
c)	Dr. Gruwell	c)	1	2	3	4
d)	Mrs. Hymel	d)	1	2	3	4
e)	Mrs. Levy	e)	1	2	3	4
f)	Mrs. Kaufman	f)	1	2	3	4
g)	Dr. Rucker	g)	1	2	3	4

EXPERIENCED

a)	Dr. Dixon	a)	1	2	3	4
b)	Mr. Easton	b)	1	2	3	4
c)	Mrs. Jones	c)	1	2	3	4
d)	Dr. Lloyd	d)	1	2	3	4
e)	Mrs. Schadowsky	e)	1	2	3	4

BEGINNING

a)	Miss Dailer	a)	1	2	3	4
b)	Mrs. Ducamus	b)	1	2	3	4
c)	Maloney	c)	1	2	3	4
d)	Mrs. North	d)	1	2	3	4
e)	Dr. Rosenberg	e)	1	2	3	4
f)	Dr. Sturgis	f)	1	2	3	4
g)	Mrs. Spencer	g)	1	2	3	4
h)	Mr. Suhor	h)	1	2	3	4
i)	Dr. Usdin	i)	1	2	3	4

4) How would you evaluate your small group discussions on each of the following points?

	a) clarity of purpose	4a)	1	2	3	4
	b) relevance of ideas discussed	b)	1	2	3	4
	c) quality of group leadership	c)	1	2	3	4
	d) rapport amoung group members	d)	1	2	3	4
5)	How effective were the field experiences in their contributions to the purpose of the Institute.	5)	1	2	3	4
6)	How valuable were the library reading materials in contributing to your understanding of ideas basic to the Institute program?	6)	1	2	3	4
7)	How in general would you evaluate the informal aspects of the program(lunch,coffee, etc.) in their contribution to achieving the goals of the Institute?	7)	1	2	3	4
8)	How did you feel about the adequacy of the meeting rooms and facilities for the Institute?	8)	1	2	3	4
9)	What single activity or aspect of the Institute was of greatest value to you? Why? (Use space below and back of page as necessary.)	9)	1	2	3	4

10) What single activity or aspect of the Institute was of least value to you? Why? (Use space below and back of page as necessary)

11) What further comments would you offer converning the effectiveness of the Institute or recommendations for its improvements? (Use space below and back of page as necessary)

SELF APPRAISAL

Please answer each of the following questions, using the scale provided for each question. Circle the letter which most nearly represents your opinion.

1) In general how do you feel the Institute has changed your ability to work effectively in a racially mixed school?

   a) considerably decreased
   b) slightly decreased
   c) slightly increased
   d) considerably

2) How has your understanding of members of the opposite race (Negro or White) been changed?

   a) considerably decreased
   b) slightly decreased
   c) slightly increased
   d) considerably increased

3) Similarly, how has your understanding of your own race been changed?

   a) considerably decreased
   b) slightly decreased
   c) slightly increased
   d) considerably increased

4) How often during the Institute did you help a member of your race gain a better understanding of members of the opposite race?

   a) never
   b) seldom
   c) regularly
   d) frequently

5) Similarly, how often during the Institute did you help members of the opposite race gain a better understanding of members of your race?

   a) never
   b) seldom
   c) regularly
   d) frequently

6) As a result of the Institute , to what extent do you feel that you have gained skills which will enable you to facilitate the process of desegregation in your school?

   a) not at all
   b) to a slight extent
   c) to a moderate extent
   d) to a considerable extent

7) As a result of your participatant in the Institute, do you feel any greater sense of responsibility in your school to take an active role in bring about a full degree of intergration?

a) no more than before
b) slightly more than before
c) moderately more than before
d) considerably more than before

8) As a result of your participation in the Institute , do you now feel any greater sense of responsibility in your community to take an active role in bring about a full degree of integration?

a) no more than before
b) slightly more than before
c) moderately more than before
d) considerably more than before

9) As a result of the Institute , what things will you do differently in your classroom, school system, or community? (Use space below and back of page as necessary)

10) Which films and film strips were most beneficial to you?

a)	Minorities Have Made American Great	1	2	3	4
b)	Exploding the Myths of Prejudice	1	2	3	4
c)	That They May Learn	1	2	3	4
d)	Children Are Creative	1	2	3	4
e)	Frederick Douglass	1	2	3	4
f)	Benjamin Danneker	1	2	3	4
g)	The Eye of the Beholder	1	2	3	4
h)	Human Values Series	1	2	3	4
i)	Let Them Learn	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX V

A. RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES FOR INTERVISITATION

B. RECOMMENDED PROJECT AREAS FOR SMALL GROUP WORK

C. DEVELOPMENT OF DESEGREGATION---GUIDELINES FOR THE TEACHER

Desegregation Institute, Follow-up Series
Dillard University, Spring 1970

Submitted by: Group II
Doris M. Dietrich,
Seminar leader

Development of Desegregation - Guidelines for the Teacher

I. Attitude toward students

- A. Self acceptance of assignment, first step
- B. Approach with professionalism and positivity
- C. Be yourself, don't be afraid
- D. Expect criticism and accept criticism, don't be on defensive
- E. Many conflicts do not have racial overtones
- F. Listen to what children have to say
  1. Give children opportunities for expressing hostile feeling (especially about race - also rebellion against middle class values).
- G. Aware that
  1. Children are children
  2. Children frequently view teacher of opposite race with suspicion
  3. Confidence must be built; takes time
- H. Learn and use names of children
- I. Always remain the teacher, the responsible adult
  1. Do not enter peer relationship
  2. Friendly but firm
- J. Adopt new philosophy
  1. "You're not in popularity contest" (Except with highly motivated students, important that children like you").
  2. Avoid preaching and moralizing

II. Discipline

- A. Become a student of behavior
  1. Strive for understanding of

Development of Desegregation -
Guidelines for the Teacher (continued)

    a. Different levels of behavior
    b. Background of child
    c. Causes of non-conforming behavior

  2. Learn to manage surface behavior

B. Know that desirable by-product of efficient classroom management is effective teaching

C. Merit, not command respect

D. When things go wrong

  1. Use clinical approach
  22 Keep cool head
  3. Don't argue with children or provide audience for tantrum
  4. Don't take as personal affront to self or school

E. Language of prejudice

  1. Learn and teach avoidance of
  2. Apply with adults as well

F. Teach democratic behavior

G. Re-appraise "Praise"

H. Punishment

  1. Corporal - use of
  2. Detention - use and effect of
  3. Suspension
  4. Must understand "Psychology of Punishment"

I. Administration's Role

  1. Principal must support teacher; top-level must support principal
  2. Definite policy should be established
  3. Help should be given children with problems

III. Toward instructional program

A. Varied as possible - use different methods

B. Student involvement

C. Individualize instruction

D. Teach where children are

E. Motivation - (Better understanding needed)

Development of Desegregation -
Guidelines for the Teacher (continued)

1. More than exposure to stimuli, demanding, and reporting
2. Must think important and reach point where he decides to want to learn
3. Must have receptive structure

    a. Ego strength that provides goal direction
    b. Feeling of ability to achieve
    c. Have model of sufficient importance

F. Reading

1. Remedial program

    a. Should be re-vamped
    b. Admittance should not be on I. Q. only
    c. Preference now given to children who have skills - non-readers excluded
    d. Tutorial group therapy should be employed

G. Emphasis should be on basic skills in all subject areas

H. Roles of "extra" teachers should be clearly defined (librarian, P. E., music).

IV. Relationships with other teachers

A. Spirit of cooperation

B. In racial situations don't ignore, don't patronize

C. Awareness of language of prejudice

D. Avoid "the way we do it here", the join "they" group- (Refers to staff in school) or the "You people ought to..."

E. Increase contact over common problems

V. Relationships with principal

A. Minority teacher should not be given unrealistic assignment, most difficult children, hardest yard duty

B. Resent being put on display

C. Willingness to give and take

D. Aware of rights and responsibilities

1. Recognize teacher as professional - not personal servant

Development of Desegregation -
Guidelines for the Teacher (continued)

2. Should not
    - a. Talk down to teachers
    - b. Criticize in front of children or over P. A.
3. Should
    - a. See that all teachers teach
    - b. Do not visit in halls with other teachers over extended periods
    - c. Attend parties and leave children alone
    - d. Sell "things" to children (cakes, candies, sandwiches)
    - e. Include teachers in planning activities Consider and test innovative ideas
    - f. Have meaningful faculty meetings - not preach sessions
    - g. Reprimand those not doing duty - not all teachers
    - h. Assume yard-duty as schedule

E. Do not delegate to secretary professional tasks

F. Keep confidential information confidential

VI. Relationship with top-level administration

A. Contacts with Personnel Department

1. More personal
2. Notices carefully worded, "Will you accept?"

B. Provisions for coffee break and lunch hour should be made for all teachers

RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES FOR INTERVISITATION

PRINCIPALS' WORKSHOP ON DESEGREGATION

April, 1970

The following is a suggested list of probable activities to be modified or adapted to serve individual school needs for the intervisitation program.

1. Careful pre-planning with present staff for intervistation

2. A committee of host teachers to receive new teachers

3. Welcome of new teachers and brief orientation by the principal

4. Meeting of as many teachers as possible in the faculty lounge on arrival, with provision for coffee if possible

5. A committee of parents to meet new teachers and assist with courtesies

6. Prepared packet for each new teacher containing:
    a. Agenda for the day
    b. Floor plan of school
    c. Brief history of school
    d. Student handbook
    e. Faculty handbook
    f. Faculty listing with room numbers
    g. Other pertinent materials

7. Classroom visitation by new teachers:
   Assignment of rooms which teachers will visit without restricting grade, room, or class to new teacher's specific assignment

8. Tour of school plant with students as tour guides

9. Planned time for observation of recess, intermission, lunch program, dismissal, loading of busses

10. A brief informal faculty meeting at close of school day

Compiled by workshop group:recorders:
Alice M. Benjamin
Louise M. Bouise
Elvira S. Lawson
Leah M. McKenna
Clare M. Schadowsky

MEMORANDUM

TO: Seminar Leaders: Desegregation Institute, Follow-Up Series

FROM: Arthur R. Piattoly, Planning and Evaluating Co-ordinator

DATE: March 30, 1970

SUBJECT: Recommended Project Areas for Small Group Work

1. Identification of Problem Areas--Decide upon use of consultant services

2. Development of Desegregation guidelines
   - a) The Teacher:
     1. Attitude of the teacher to the students
     2. Attitude of the teacher toward the Instructional program
     3. In relationships with other teachers
     4. In relationships to principal
   - b. The Principal:
     1. Giving guidance and inspiration to the Instructional Staff
     2. Reflecting confidence in the ability of teachers
     3. Creating an atmosphere of freedom
     4. Releasing creativity of the staff
     5. Developing the professional status of teachers
     6. Providing avenues for expressing teacher concerns: faculty-administration dialogue
   - c. Community
     1. What can the school do to avoid or assist in the resolution of community problems embedded in interracial prejudice and hostility?
     2. What problems have been occassioned by school desegregation; What can be done to reduce tension or ease attitudes to these problems?
     3. What roles should other agencies or groups play in desegregation; should the school play the chief role in desegregating the community?
     4. What are the attitudes of the community groups and agencies concerning the school? To what extent do these attitudes reflect the same objectives as those of the school?
     5. Who are the most powerful persons in the formal organization of the community and of special groups? Are these persons the ones who 'get things done.'

d. The Student:
   1. The background of the student
      a) Socio-economic, cultural ramifications
      b) Special problems
      c) Problem of racial stereotypes.
   2. Special problems
      a) Lingual, academic retardation-curriculum relationships
   3. Teacher expectations of the pupil and vice-versa
   4. Improving self-image of students: curriculum-experiential considerations
   5. Teacher-pupil relationships
      a) Strategies for obtaining discipline
      b) Strategies for obtaining a good learning atmosphere
      c) Techniques for handling disruptive students
      d) Identification of special needs of pupils

e. Organizing for Instructional Improvement:
   1. The principals role
   2. The teachers role
   3. Utilization of community resources
   4. How to organize systematically to identify problem areas, define objectives, create a problem solving design, gather resources and systematically evaluate progress toward clearly stated objectives.

Arthur R. Piattoly

Arthur R. Piattoly
Planning & Evaluating Co-ordinator

ARP:ks

APPENDIX VI

MEMORANDA AND AGENDA PERTINENT TO FOLLOW-UP PHASE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Seminar Moderators: Principals Desegregation Workshop

FROM: Ray Piattoly, Planning & Evaluation Coordinator

DATE: April 18, 1970

SUBJECT: Orientation.

Please be aware of the following guidelines for operation of the workshop.

1) The overall purpose of the workshop is to develop awarenesses in principals necessary for successful faculty desegregation and to involve principals in planning some appropriated, related activities.

2) Please call roll and keep an accounting of attendance for all sessions that you conduct. Project guidelines are clear in this regard.

3) A limited amount of materials are being purchased for use of project participants.

4) Please appoint group recorder. A major objective of the sessions is to gather the feelings of principals in key areas. Your findings will be presented to me at the termination of the sessions.

5) Explore the feelings of the group regarding times and dates of future sessions.

6) Initiative of seminar moderators is invited in suggesting audio-visual aids to the sessions and the use of appropriate resource consultants.

7) Try to keep the sessions directed toward goals suggested in the discussion outline. This, of course, is not intended to deny necessary and normal group process.

8) The afternoon sessions for April 18 are for recapitulation and possibly exploration of library facilities. Participants have use of Dillard library facilities.

9) A staff meeting will be scheduled before the next session.

10) Please try to make as prompt use of the consultants as possible when they report to your group. Some will have time to visit only briefly.

Ray Piattoly
Planning & Evaluation Coordinator

ARP:kms

cc: Mr. Robert E. Wall

MEMORANDUM

To: All Participants: Staff Development Institute on Desegregation Problems

From: Arthur R. Piattoly
Planning & Evaluation Coordinator

Date: May 25, 1970

Subject: Evaluation of Saturday Meetings

I wish to thank you for the high degree of professionalism exhibited by you in our recent Saturday sessions devoted to problems incident to faculty desegregation. Your cooperation has been a credit to the school system and to its efforts to accomplish a difficult task of human relations and professional accomplishment.

In order that future activities of a similar nature can be of a highly effective nature in terms of the needs of principals and teachers, please take some time from what we know is a busy schedule and return the enclosed questionnaire to me at your earliest convenience.

Please also be assured that every effort will be made to disseminate findings of all seminar teams to all concerned.

Arthur R. Piattoly
Arthur R. Piattoly
Planning & Evaluation Coordinator

ARP:kms

QUESTIONNAIRE

Staff Development Institute on Desegregation Problems

Please answer all questions and return as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope in care of Arthur R. Piattoly. Some of the items are included to satisfy requirements for various government reports.

A. Please list what you think were any values gained from participation in the sessions (administrative, instructional, human relations, etc.)

B. What do you think are the areas of greatest concern to the principal (or to the teacher) that relate to faculty desegregation.

C. Did the sessions serve to satisfy any particular need of yours as a teacher or principal?

D. How could the sessions have been improved?

E. Your position ______Teacher ______Principal

F. Race ______White ______Black

G. Level ______Elementary ______Secondary

Name:______________________________

Date:______________________________

School:____________________________

Agenda: April 18, 1970

Principals Desegregation Workshop

I	9:00-9:10	Ray Piattoly: Introduction, program orientation introduction of moderators, groupings, room assignments; future meetings
II	9:10-9:25	Everett Williams: The importance of the principal and the role of the workshop
III	9:25-10:45	Discussion and group work
IV	10:45-11:00	Break
V	11:05-12:00	Continuation of group work
VI	12:00-12:30	Lunch
VII	12:30-2:30	Recapitulation and exploration of library facilities and resources

Administrators Workshop: Desegregation Problems

Agenda: April 25, 1970

Dillard University

9:00-9:15	Address: Dr. Mack Spears, Orleans Parish School Board
9:15-9:30	Address: Mr. Edwin Friedrich: Director of Curriculum Services, Administrative Staff, Orleans Parish School Board
9:30-10:15	Reports of group recorders
10:30-11:00	Small group discussion
11:10-11:25	Break and resumption of group work
12:00-12:30	Lunch
1:00-2:00	Small group discussion

Special Note: Teacher-consultants will visit those small groups that they were unable to meet at last Saturday's session.

AGENDA: MAY 2, 1976

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH WORKSHOP ON DESEGREGATION PROBLEMS

9:00-9:30	Address: Dr. Glenn Hontz 'Faculty Team Building in Schools' Questions & answers
9:30-11:00	Small group discussion Consultants: Dr. Hontz; Mr. Bermudez
11:00-11:15	Break
12:00-12:30	Lunch
12:30-2:30	Finalization of desegregation guidelines. Identification of principals interested in planning a panel on desegregation problems for video-taping.

APPENDIX VII

SYLLABI FOR SUMMER PHASE

INSTITUTE FOR THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS
EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1969

9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m. GENERAL SESSION	John F. Kennedy Senior High 5700 Wisner Boulevard Auditorium
PURPOSES OBJECTIVES PROCEDURES CONTENT	Mrs. O.W. Nelson, Director
DESIGN REGISTRATION GRADUATE CREDIT FISCAL MATTERS	Mr. Arthur Piattoly, Assistant

11:00 - 12:00 Noon
REGISTRATION _ Tulane University

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m. Experienced teachers	Gibson Hall, Tulane University

Formulation and Identification of Problems
Selection of Projects/Research Papers

Group I	Room 305	Mrs. Williams
Group II	Room 308	Mrs. Wolo
Group III	Room 310	Mr. Cooper

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1969

9:00 a.m.
"Desegregation and Integration"

Address: Dr. Norman Dixon
Professor of Education
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

132

Exchange

11:00 a.m.
SEMINARS

Group I	Room 305	Mrs. Williams
Group II	Room 308	Mrs. Wolo
Group III	Room 310	Mr. Cooper

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
SYMPOSIUM Room 317

"Experiences, Problems and Solutions in Recently Desegregated Schools"

--- Mrs. Olmpia Boucree,
Mrs. Romaine R. Jones
Mrs. Phyllis Kaufman
Mr. Vidal Easton

2:00 p.m. Room 317

"Identification of Verbal Interaction in the Classroom Where Problems May Arise"

Address: Dr. Joseph Bondi
Professor of Education
University of South Florida, Tampa
Tampa, Florida

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1969

9:00 a.m.
OBSERVATION IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

Group I	Priestly Junior High 1619 Leonidas Street (Leonidas Bus)
Group II	To Kingsley House for Observation in Day Nursery, Kindergarten, Arts, Crafts, Special Groups, Swimming , in an Integrated situation

Group III - Allen School
5625 Loyola Avenue (Freret Bus)

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
FILMS — Exploding the Myths of Prejudice
Room 317

DISCUSSION

2;00p.m.
WORKSHOP — Room 317
Using the Analysis Sheets with
Matrix: Group Leaders

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1969

9:00 a.m. - 12:00 Noon
OBSERVATIONS

Group I	Priestly Junior High
Group II	Audubon School 428 Broadway (Broadway Bus, St. Charles (
Group III	To Kingsley House

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
GROUP COUNSELING

Group I	Dr. Bondi
Group II	Psychologist
Group III	Seminar Leader

(Rotate each 40 minutes)

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1969

9:00 a.m.
OBSERVATION IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS (Priestly,Audubon, Allen)

"Identification of Verbal Behavior with the use of Matrix and Check List"

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
LECTURE Gibson Hall, Room 317

"The Effect of Community Pressure on Successful School Desegregation"

Address: Dr. Gary Lloyd
Professor
Tulane School of Social Work

Exchange

2:00 p.m.
SEMINARS Group II and III

Examination of Reading Lists--Specific Attention to following books:

The Troublesome Presence

Race Prejudice and Education

Pygmalion in the Classroom
Others prescribed by leaders

N. B. Reports due orally and in writing,
June 25, 1969 All Groups

Group I To Kingsley House for Observation

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1969

9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.
OBSERVATION IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

Notice given to language, instruction, and verbal interaction.

11:00 a.m.
SEMINARS WITH LEADERS

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
SEMINARS

Group I	Psychologist
Group II	Group Leader
Group III	Leader

(Rotate each 40 minutes)

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1969

9:00 a.m.
OBSERVATION IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m. Room 317, Gibson Hall

Types of Interaction Observed in Laboratory Schools

Group I To Kingsley House

2:00 p.m.
SEMINARS WITH LEADERS

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1969

9:00 a.m.
FILM VIEWING "Minorities Have Made American Great"
Italian, German, Afro-American,
Irish

11:00 a.m.
SEMINAR - Discussion of Films

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
BOOK REPORTS WITH SEMINAR LEADERS

2:00 p.m.
BREAK

2:15 p.m.
Continuation of Book Reports with Leaders

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1969

9:00 a.m.
OBSERVATION IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
BOOK FAIR Dillard University Dining Rooms B & C
Student Union Buil

Selection of Topics for Annotated Bibliography

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1969

9:00 a.m.
TEAM REPORTS AND DISCUSSION ON PRESCRIBED TEXTBOOKS

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
USE OF LIBRARY AND BOOK FAIR AT DILLARD UNIVERSITY

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1969

ENTIRE GROUP MOVES TO DILLIARD UNIVERSITY, Room 224 Rosenward Ha
(2601 Gentilly Boulevard, Gentilly Broad Bus)

9:00 a.m.
GROUP DISCUSSION "Motivation in Education"

10:30 a.m.
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Group I	Room 119B,	Rosenwald Hall
Group II	Room 119C,	Rosenwald Hall
Group III	Room 226A,	Rosenwald Hall

Social Worker
(rotates every 40 minutes)

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m. Discussion of Lieterature on Motivation

2:00 p.m. Seminars with Leaders and Social Worker

TUESDAY, JULY 1, 1969

9:00 a.m.
LABORATORY EXPERIENCES AT ASSIGNED SCHOOLS

Group I	Edward H. Phillips Jr. High
Group II	Stuart Bradley Elementary
Group III	Edward H. Phillips Elementary View movie "Intruder in the Dust"

1:00 p.m.

"Motivation in Education"

LECTURE:

Dr. Melvin Gruwell
Director, Center for Teacher Education
Tulane University

WEDNESDAY, JULY 2, 1969

9:00 a.m.
PRESENTATION Discussion on Techniques of Motivation
Social Worker

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
LIBRARY AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT: DIRECTED OBSERVATION

THURSDAY, JULY 3, 1969

9:00 a.m.
OBSERVATION IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m. Work on Collections of Interracial Materials, Pictures, Bibliographies for Classroom Use

2:00 p.m.
GROUP DISCUSSIONS — Library Work on Research Papers and Projects
Social Worker

FRIDAY, JULY 4, 1969

HOLIDAY

MONDAY, JULY 7, 1969

9:00 a.m. — Room 224, Rosenwald Hall, Dillard

"Enhancing the Self Image: — Mrs. Judy Levy
Psychologist

10:00 a.m.
SMALL GROUP SEMINARS — SOCIAL WORKER

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m..
PRACTICUM: — "Where Integration Is Working"
Miss Claire Schadowsky, Principal
Sophie Wright School

INTERACTION

2:00 p.m.
FILM FESTIVAL: — Motion Pictures:
"That They May Learn"
"Children Are Creative"
"The Eye of The Beholder"

Still Film
"Human Values"

TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1969

9:00 a.m.
DIRECTED OBSERVATION IN LABORATORY SCHOOLS

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
REPORTING AND REVIEWING RECENT READING IN SEMINAR GROUPS
SOCIAL WORKER

139

2:00 p.m.
Working on Projects for Use in Integrated Situations

WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 1969

9:00 a.m.
CONCLUSION OF PROJECTS AND PROBLEMS
-- Small Group Seminars
Social Worker

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.	Room 224, Rosewald Hall
ADDRESS:	Dr. W. Ray Rucker Dean of the Graduate School U. S. International University San Diego, California

2:00 p.m.
SMALL GROUP SEMINAR   SOCIAL WORKER

THURSDAY, JULY 10, 1969

9:00 a.m.
Self Evaluation with use of Attitudinal Checklist
Measure Change and Progress in Terms of Objectives

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
Small Groups with Seminar Leaders and Dr. Rucker
Social Worker

FRIDAY, JULY 11, 1969

9:00 a.m.   Room 224, Rosenwald Hall
Dr. Rucker and Human Values   Symposium
Exchange
Social Worker

12:00 Noon
LUNCH

1:00 p.m.
SELF EVALUATION ON OBJECTIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

SYLLABUS: INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION: NEW TEACHERS

OBJECTIVES: ORIENTATION: IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEM: FORMULATION OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECT GOALS

FIRST WEEK

Week of June 16

June 16	9:00-10:00	Orientation and Introductions Mrs. Nelson; Mr. Piattoly Seminar Leaders (Kennedy Auditorium).
	11:00-12:00	Registration-Tulane University
	1:00-3:00	Registration; team meetings on project identification (Tulane: Gibson Hall Rooms 305-308-310 and 317).
	3:00-5:00	Staff meeting: E. I. P. Office; Room 102 Fortier Hall.
June 17	9:00-12:00	Team meetings with Seminar Leaders; Room 224 Rosenwald Hall further work on Institute assignments.
	1:00-3:00	Library work; completion of registration.
June 18	9:00-11:00	Room 224 Rosenwald Hall: Dr. Joseph Bondi: "The Role of Language in the Desegregated Setting." (Break)
	11:00-12:00	Team meetings; Consultant Dr. Bondi.
	1:00-3:00	Team meetings-Project Development.

June 19	9:00-12:00	Observation in laboratory schools; (to be announced) team meetings.
	1:00-2:00	Psychological and Sociological perspectives to the problems of Desegregation (Staff Psychologist and Social Worker). Room 224 Rosenwald Hall.
	2:00-3:00	Team meeting-Consultants-Staff Psychologist and Social Worker.
June 20	9:00-1200	Observation in laboratory schools-team meetings.
	1:00-3:00	Discussion-Minorities Have Made American Great: Room 224 Rosenwald Hall.

OBJECTIVES: SOCIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ANTECEDENTS TO LEARNING

SECOND WEEK

Week of June 23

June 23	9:00-10:00	Room 224, Rosenwald Hall "The Role of Self-Image and Teacher Expectation in Learning" Mrs. Levy
	10:00-12:00	Library time-team meetings.
	1:00-3:00	Teams A & B library time Team C-Team meeting with Seminar Leaders and Staff Social Worker.
June 24	9:00-10:00	"Sociological Perspectives To The Problem" Miss Betty Spencer: Room 224, Rosenwald Hall.
	10:00-12:00	Team meetings with Seminar Leaders: Consultants

		Miss Betty Spencer and Staff Social Worker *Dr. Gene Usdin
	1:00-3:00	Library time-Team C; Teams A & B meet with Social Worker
June 25	9:00-11:00	Room 224, Rosenwald Hall Panel, "Problems encountered in the desegregated setting- Point of View_ Mrs. North; Mrs. Kaufman;‾ Miss Dalier; Mrs. Boucree- Moderator; Mr. Piattoly (Room 224, Rosenwald Hall).
	11:00-12:00	Team meetings-panel functions as Consultants.
	1:00-3:00	Library work on projects
June 26	9:00-12:00	All teams visit Book Fair Cafeteria Area- Dillard University
	1:00-3:00	All teams consult with Staff Psychologist.
June 27	9:00-12:00	Observation in the lab schools, team meetings.
	1:00-3:00	All teams consult staff Psychologist and Socail Worker

OBJECTIVES: DEVELOPING AN EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL CLIMATE IN DESEGREGATED SITUATIONS

THIRD WEEK

TRANSFER OF GROUPS TO DIFFERENT UNIVERSITIES

Week of June 30

June 30	9:00-10:00	Room 317 , Gibson Hall, Tulane Campus- Dr. Melvin Gruwell- "Establishing Classroom Conditions For Learning in Desegregated Situations.

---

*Dr. Gene Usdin (Sociological and Psychological Perspectives)

	10:00-12:00	Team meetings- Dr. Gruwell Consultant.
	1:00-3:00	Use of the library
July 1	9:00-12:00	Observation in lab schools- team meetings.
	1:00-3:00	Team meetings (Room 305; 308; 310- Gibson Hall). Theme: Improving Insturction Through Recognition of Individual Differences: Consultants- Mrs. Maloney; Mr. Charles Suhor; Mrs. Rita Ducamus.
July 2	9:00-11:00	The Role of Media in Inproving Instruction.
	1:00-3:00	Dr. Gruwell, "Establishing Classroom Conditions for Learning in Desegregated Situations."
July 3	9:00-12:00	Observation in lab schools; team meetings.
	1:00-3:00	Dr. Jack Sturgis- "The Role of Guidance And Counseling In a Desegregated Setting."
July 4	HOLIDAY	

OBJECTIVES: THE PROBLEM OF EVALUATION AND COMMUNICATION IN DESEGREGATED TEACHING AND LEARNING

FOURTH WEEK

Week of July 7

July 7	9:00-10:00	Dr. Malcolm Rosenberg "Evaluating pupil Programs In Desegregated Situations Room 317, Gibson Hall
	11:00-12:00	Team meetings.

	1:00-3:00	Library work
July 8	9:00-12:00	Observation in lab schools; team meetings.
	1:00-3:00	Library work on project.
July 9	9:00-11:00	"Language Patterns In The Classroom-Approaches To More Effective Communication" Mr. Charles Suhor, Room 317 Gibson Hall.
	11:00-12:00	Team meetings.
	1:00-3:00	Team meetings.
July 10	9:00-10:00	Dr. Ray Rucker, "Enhancing Human Values." 317 Gibson Hall
	10:00-12:00	Evaluation of Institute Objectives
	1:00-3:00	Library Work.
July 11	9:00-11:00	Team meetings; collection of projects.
	11:00-12:00	Film
	1:00-3:00	Summary report by Seminar Leaders on Institute outcome.

APPENDIX VIII

SEMINAR REPORT FROM FOLLOW-UP PHASE ON ONE GROUP'S ACTIVITY

1969 Institute for Teachers in Desegregated Schools
Follow-Up Sessions
Seminar Leader's Report

Follow-up sessions to the 1969 Summer Institute were held April 4, April 11, and May 2, 1970. Originally, it had been hoped that follow-up could commence six weeks after the beginning of the 1969-1970 school session. This would have provided a sufficient period to assess concepts and practices freshly gained from the summer Institute. For apparently administrative reasons, this was not possible. The delay until April, however, was not without its advantages since there was more time to reflect on the impact of the Institute over a more representative period of the school session.

Some teachers of the original group that I led in the summer were necessarily lost. Individual schedules would not allow some of the participants to take part in the follow-up and some teachers had resigned. There was a sufficient nucleus, however, to quickly re-establish rapport even though three new teachers were added to the group.

At the second session I exposed the group to a sample of "programmed" tapes specifically designed to facilitate racial interaction. The material I used was loaned by the Human Development Institute of Atlanta, Georgia--a subsidiary of the Bell and Howell Company. The set was entitled, Encountertapes for Black/White Groups. The program was designed for five hour-and one-half sessions. I used only the first tape with this group, modifying the instruction in accordance with my judgment as to the suitability of some of the exercises to this particular group. The first tape is so designed that it can be used by itself for just such demonstrations.

At the first follow-up session I introduced the idea of using the Encountertapes and the suggestion met with universal enthusiasm. Nevertheless each participant was given an individual option of either joining in the interaction or abstaining. All members stayed in.

The exercises might have been expected to arouse some anxiety since they included free and frank interchanges of opinions and feelings. Anxiety was evident with several members but the overall encounter was seen as a stimulating and enriching experience both emotionally and attitudinally.

The final follow-up session was held jointly with a group of principals. I had feared that this might result in an experience that would be intimidating to teachers and where principals might be tempted to pontificate. My fears were only partially justified. For the most part, principals seemed to be genuinely interested in understanding the classroom teacher's point of view on anticipated problem areas. The teachers were cautious but this did not prevent them entirely from speaking out on the problems of desegregation of classrooms and faculty as they had experienced them or as they anticipated they might develop.

My group felt that more teachers in the system should be exposed to the experience they had had. They felt that an extended summer institute would be the optimal resource but that, if this were not possible, release time sessions during the school year should be conducted. They felt that such sessions should be led by professionals who were not attached to the classroom. The idea of visiting teachers conducting these sessions was entertained.

The suggestion was made that those teachers who had to change assignments in order to comply with the new faculty desegregation guidelines, should be especially encouraged to participate in such workshops. The workshops should also be open to teachers new to the school system. It was felt that principals, using resources from the central office, should schedule release-time meetings throughout the school session toward the same objective.

It is my own feeling that the Encountertapes could be profitably used in such endeavors. They are designed so that no leader is necessary however a trained coordinator should be available for consultation where problem areas arise.

Arthur Cooper
Seminar Leader

APPENDIX IX

RECOMMENDED BIBLIOGRAPHY DISTRIBUTED TO INSTITUTE MEMBERS

Summer, 1969

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION
8200 Hampson Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

AC504 866-5427

A BIBLIOGRAPHY ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

The following materials have been selected from various bibliographies, particularly one published by the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities in Washington (HEW). They have been reproduced on these pages for use of Louisiana classroom teachers. This list may be copied or used in any fashion.

Adoff, Arnold. (ed.) I Am the Darker Brother: An Anthology of Modern Poems by Negro Americans. New York: Macmillan, 1963. $1.00

Anderson, Margaret. Children of the South. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1966.

Archibald, Helen A. (ed.) Negro History and Culture. Selections for Use with Children. Department of Curriculm Development. Chicago City Missionary Society, 19 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60603. 75¢

Arnez, Nancy L. "The Effect of Teacher Attitudes upon the Culturally Different," School and Society, March 19, 1966.

Ausubel, David P. and Pearl. "Ego Development among Segregated Negro Children," in A. Harry Passow (ed.) Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Bady, Susan. "What I learned from Negroes," Ebony, September, 1966.

Beauchamp, Mary and Others. Building Brotherhood: What Can Elementary Teachers Do? National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Bell, Kenneth and others. Intelligence and Cultural Differences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Blair, Lewis H. A Southern Prophecy. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1964.

Boyd, G. F. "The Levels of Aspiration of White and Negro Children in a Non-Segregated Elementary School," Journal of Social Psychology. Vol. 36, 1952.

Boyle, Sarah. The Desegregated Heart. New York: Morow, 1962.

Boyle, Sarah. The Human Beings Only. New York: Seabury Press, 1964.

Bridges to Understanding. A quarterly bulletin of the Human Relations Unit, Office of Integration, New York Public Schools.

Brownell, Samuel. "Teaching the Child from the Disadvantaged Neighborhood," Journal of Teaching Education, June, 1965.

Chesler, M. and Segal P. Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Public Schools in the Deep South. Ann Arbor, Michigan. Institute for Social Research, 1967.

Clark, Kenneth. Dark Ghetto: An Analysis of Social Power. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Clark, Kenneth. Prejudice and Your Child. Boston: Beacon Press. Paperback, 1963.

Coles, Robert. Children of Crisis: A Study of Courage and Fear. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

Cooper, David. "Nobody Wanted School Desegregation," American Education, June, 1967.

Crain, Robert L. The Politics of School Desegregation. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

Crosby, Muriel. "The Community and Its Schools: An Adventure in Human Relations," Children, January-February, 1964.

Darling, Richard L. "School Library Services for the Culturally Deprived Child," School Life, October, 1964.

Education, September, 1964. Twenty-five cents. Order from Publication Sales Office, Board of Education, 110 Livengston Street, Brooklyn 1, New York.

Ehle, John. The Free Men. New York: Harper and Row, 1965. Integration in Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Eisenberg, Leon. "Some Children Are Convinced They Can't Win," Southern Education Report, April, 1967.

Emotional Aspects of School Desegregation. A Report by Psychiatrists Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, 104 E. 25th Street, New York, 10, N. Y. 50¢ each (30¢ for 100 copies or more)

Goodman, Mary Ellen. Race Awareness in Young Children. New York: Collier Books, 1964.

Grier, William & Cobbs, Price M. Black Rage. New York: Bantam, 1969, 95¢

Griffin, John Howard. Black Like Me. Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1961.

Handlin, Oscar. "...Out of Many: A Study Guide to Cultural Pluralism in the United States." Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022.

Hansberry, Lorraine, The Movement. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964. (A well-illustrated paperback.)

Harlan, Louis R. The Negro in American History. Service center for Teachers of History, American Historical Association, 400 A Street, S. E., Washington D. C. 20003. 50¢. 1965

Hentoff, Nat. Our Children Are Dying. New York: Viking, 1966.

Herndon, James. The Way It Spozed to Be. New York: Bantam, 1969. 75¢

"Integration: Desirable and Possible," Christian Century, April 12, 1964.

Irelau, Lola M. (ed.) Low-Income Life Styles. U. S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1968. No. 1968-of-285-640. 35¢

Joann Carmen, Sister, C. S. F. Study of Race Relations. A Teaching Unit. Chicago, Illinois: National Catholic Conference

Katz, William L. Teacher's Guide to American Negro History. Chicago; Quadrangle Books, 1968. $2.25.

Kennedy, John F. and others. Moral Crisis: The Case for Civil Rights. Minneapolis: Gilbert Publishing Company, 1964.

Kohl, Herbert. 36 Children. New York: American Library, 1967.

Kozol, Jonathan. Death at an Early Age. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1967.

Kroger, Earl, Sr. Negro Heroes Card Game. 50¢ Earl Kroger Co., 3605 Cedardale Road, Baltimore, Md. 21215.

Kroger, Earl, Sr. Negro History Coloring Book. (same as above)

Kvaraceus, William. Negro Self-Concept: Implications for School and Citizenship. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Lewis, Oscar. "The Culture of Poverty," Trans-action, Nov. 1963.

Major, Reginald W. "Integration for Excellence," Nation, September 12, 1966.

Mann, Pete. "I Guess We're Just Impatient," American Education, March, 1966.

McGill, Ralph. A Church, A School. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1959.

McKean, Keith F. Cross Currents in the South. Denver: A. Swallow, 1960.

McWhirter, Mary Esther. Books for Friendship. Philadelphia: American Friends Service Committee, 1962. Annotated list of 500 books, graded from kindergarten to upper junior high school, which attempts to "depict, fairly, accurately and sympathetically people of all religious, racial, regional, national, and economic groups."

Mizell, Hayes. "Public Education and Community Organization," New South, Winter, 1969. 10¢ reprint

Montagu, Ashley. What We Know about Race. Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022 25¢

National Education Commission, Educational Policies Commission. Education and the Disadvantaged American. Washington, D. C.: National Educational Association, 1962.

Noar, Gertrude. The Teacher and Integration. NEA publication No. 381-11760. Student National Education Association, NEA, 1201 16th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Noar, Gertrude. Teaching and Learning the Democratic Way. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Pearl, Arthur. "(Ability) Grouping Hurts the Poor," Southern Education Report, December, 1966.

153

Riessman, Frank. *The Culturally Deprive Child*. New York: Harper Bros., 1962.

Rosenthal, Robert and Jacobson, Lenore, *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

School Desegregation Kit. Southern Regional Council, 5 Forsyth Street, N. W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303. May 17, 1965. Free

Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in Black and White*. New York: Random House, 1964.

Staff, Sheldon. *The Two-Way Street: Guideposts to Peaceful School Desegregation*. David-Stewart Publishing Company, 3612 Washington Boulevard Indianapolis, Indianna 46205, 1967.

Sterling, Dorothy. *Tear Down the Walls: A History of the American Civil Rights Movement*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co.

Stringfellow, William. *My People Is the Enemy*. New York: Anchor, 1966. 95¢

Weinberg, Meyer. *Learning Together*. Chicago: Integrated Education Association, 1964.

Weinberg, Meyer. *Race and Place: A Legal History of the Neighborhood School*. U. S. Government Printing Office, No. 1968-o-273-084. 45¢

FILM BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Chance at the Beginning," Institute for Developmental Studies of the New York University, Department of Psychiatry and New York City Board of Education.

"Children Without," Publication Sales Division, National Education Association, Washington, D. C. 30 min.

"History of Negroes," Eight filmstrips-New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

"The History of the American Negroes," A series of eight color film strips. Intermediate grades through senior high school. Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission, 1401 Labor and Industry Building, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

"The Mercer Project: A Path to Peaceful School Desegregation," 25 minutes. Georgia Media Relations, Department M. P., U. S. Community Relations Service, Washington, D. C. 20530.

"A Question of Chairs: The Challenge to American Education," CBS Television and Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith.

Redden, Carolyn L. "The American Negro: An Annotated List of Educational Films and Filmstrips," Journal of Negro Education, Winter, 1964.

The Office of Education, Division of Equal Eductional Opportunities acknowledges with appreciation valuable information gained from School Integration: A Comprehensive Classified Bibliography of 3,100 References edited by Meyer Weinberg and A Bibliography on School Desegregation, Race Relations and the Disadvantaged compiled by Elais Blake, Jr.